THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—III

"Clavariaceae"

M. A. DONK

Reprinted from

REINWARDTIA

Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia
Volume 2, Part 3, pp. 441-493 (1954)

Printed by ARCHIPEL, Bogor, Java

MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
10 SEP 1956

REINWARDTIA
Published by Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia
Volume 2, Part 3, pp. 441-493 (1954)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—III *

"Clavariaceae"

M. A. DONK **

SUMMARY

1. This third part deals with "Clavariaceae," a family designation used in a traditional and descriptive, rather than a taxonomic, sense.

2. Two of the author's previously published proposals for the conservation of certain names are replaced by slightly altered ones. They aim at the safeguarding of the names *Clavulinopsis* Overeem, *Lachnocladium* Lév., and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. A proposal to conserve *Pterula* Fr. in its current sense is withdrawn as superfluous.

3. Some forgotten or neglected names are listed, e.g. *Scleroglossum* Pers. and *Xyloglossum* Pers. These two names are typified by a species that makes them synonyms of *Acrospermum* Tode ex Fr. (Ascomycetes).

4. The following typifications, among others, deserve attention: *Dendrocladium* Lloyd by *Lachnocladium giganteum* Pat., *Holocoryne* (Fr.) Bonord. by *Clavaria falcata* Pers. ex Fr., and *Ramaria* S. F. Gray by *Clavaria pratensis* Pers.

5. One new combination is made: *Pistillina typhae* (Höhn.) Donk (basinym, *Dacryopsis typhae* Höhn.).

INTRODUCTION.—This paper forms the third part of a series planned to give an annotated nomenclatorial enumeration of all generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes.

DEFINITION.—"Clavariaceae" as understood in the present paper covers all fungi belonging to the homobasidious Hymenomycetes that have a mostly erect, either simple and more or less club-shaped to cylindrical, or branched fruit-body, with the amphigenous hymenium smooth or somewhat rugose, the top of the fruit-body becoming fertile or remaining sterile, being pointed or truncate, in the latter case without marginal growth. Those basidiomycetes which look strikingly like "Clavariaceae," but are sterile (Deuteromycetes), are left out of account. All names based on Heterobasidiae of clavarioid appearance, too, are not considered (but cf. *Polyozus*). Thus defined, "Clavariaceae" do not include *Cantharellus*-like plants. Some genera here included are clavarioid in appearance, but may have their hymenium more or less unilateral rather than completely

* Part I of the present series ("Cyphellaceae") was published *in* Reinwardtia 1: 199-220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes), *in* Reinwardtia 2: 435-440. 1954.

** Keeper of Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia.

amphigenous: *Lachnocladium*, *Merisma* Pers. ex S. F. Gray, *Scytinopogon*, and *Sparassis* (= *Masseeola*).

I emphatically do not regard the clavarias as a natural family but use the term in a purely descriptive meaning.

ON THE CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN NAMES.—The publication of Corner's invaluable "A monograph of *Clavaria* and allied genera" *(1950)* has undoubtedly started a new epoch in the study of these fungi. It is an indispensable guide and will stimulate further research along the new lines expounded by him, and will dominate the scene for many years to come. Every previous proposal for the conservation of generic names given to "Clavariaceae" should be seriously reconsidered and tested in its light, and new ones might be induced by it.

The genera adopted by Corner in his monograph are 27 in number. Among these, there are 8, each with thirty or more species (inclusive of insufficiently known ones). Of these 8 at least 3 are likely to be considered by some authors as not bearing the correct names, so that the names as used by Corner may be replaced in the near future by different ones if no special action be taken. These names are:

(i) *Clavulinopsis* Overeem.—Endangered by *Ramaria* S. F. Gray; and by the eventual typification of *Cladaria* Ritgen, which, if of the species hitherto proposed *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff. were accepted, would become an earlier typonym. The rejection of *Ramaria* S. F. Gray against *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., already proposed in another connection; and the fixation of *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. as the type species of *Cladaria*, by listing that generic name as a nomen rejiciendum in the proposal for conservation of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., would clear this situation.

(ii) *Lachnocladium* Lév.—Endangered by its basinym, *Eriocladus* Lév., which is the correct name. Conservation of the currently used name is indicated in this case.

(iii) *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord.—This is by far the largest genus and its name endangered by the earlier homonym *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, which for technical reasons cannot be typified in such a manner as to become a metonym. If *Cladaria* Ritgen (see also above) were to be typified by *Clavaria botrytis* Pers., this name would turn into an earlier typonym. By registering both *Ramaria* S. F. Gray and *Cladaria* as nomina rejicienda, the name *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. could be saved in its predominant use (also adopted by Corner) and *Clavulinopsis* Overeem, too, would remain undisturbed.

Rejection of the two proposals tabulated below would lead to the following intolerable situation:

Clavulinopsis	would	become	*Ramaria* S. F. Gray,
Lachnocladium	would	become	*Eriocladus*, and
Ramaria (Fr.) Bonord.	might	become	*Cladaria*, or else
	would	become	*Clavariella* P. Karst.

I hope that in the "Alphabetical enumeration" below I have succeeded in setting forth with sufficient clarity the arguments of others and myself why certain typifications should not be accepted. Rejection of these typifications will undoubtedly contribute to a greater nomenclatorial stability. They are those of *Holocoryne* (Fr.) Bonord. by *Clavaria rugosa* Bull. ex Fr., defended by Doty; of *Lachnocladium* Lév. by *Clavaria furcellata* Fr., previously defended by Donk; of *Pterula* Fr. by *Clavaria penicillata* Bull. ex Fr., defended by Doty, Donk (who has changed his mind), and Rogers; and of *Ramaria* S. F. Gray by *Clavaria rugosa* Bull. ex Fr., defended by Doty. The considerable disturbances that these typifications would cause, if accepted, are reviewed in connection with the generic names in question farther on in the present paper.

I have not yet made up my mind as to the typification of *Pistillaria* Fr. There are two rivals here to select from, *Pistillaria micans* (Pers.) ex Fr. and *P. quisquiliaris* (Fr.) ex Fr. An impartial decision, based if possible on considerations acceptable to all, is much wanted in this case.

PROPOSALS

Nomina conservanda	Nomina rejicienda
Lachnocladium Lév. *in* Dict. univ. Hist. nat. 8: 487. 1846; Consid. mycol. 108. 1846. — T.: *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév.[1]	*Eriocladus* Lév. *in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. III 5: 158. 1846. — T.: *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév.[1]
Ramaria (Fr.) Bonord., Handb. Mykol. 166. 1851. — T.: *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr.	*Ramaria* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 655. 1821. — T.: *Clavaria pratensis* Pers.
	Cladaria Ritgen *in* Schr. Ges. Beförd. Naturw. Marburg 2: 94. 1831.[2] — T.: *Clavaria botrytis* Pers.[3]

ALPHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Allantula Corner *in* Ann. of Bot. II 16: 270. 1952.—ETYMOLOGY: ἀλλᾶς, -ᾶντος, sausage; -ula, suffix forming diminutives. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Allantula diffusa* Corner.

[1] A previously published proposal (rejected) specified *Clavaria furcellata* Fr.
[2] Rogers stated that the date should be 1828.
[3] A previously published proposal (rejected) suggested *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff.

Aphelaria Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 180, 690. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: *ἁφελής*, plain. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Clavaria dendroides* Jungh. — SCOPE. Introduced with 12 species.

Araeocoryne Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 194, 690. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: *ἀραιός*, slender; *κορύνη*, club. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species, and by original designation on p. 689): *Araeocoryne elegans* Corner.

Baumaniella.—See *Baumanniella.*

Baumanniella P. Henn. *in* Bot. Jb. 23: 543. 1897. — ETYMOLOGY: G. Baumann. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Baumanniella togoensis* P. Henn.—This is now sometimes regarded, probably correctly, as a member of *Physalacria* Peck; Hennings himself thought it related to that genus. If this were true, Hennings's description must be wrong in several points; see also Von Höhnel (*in* Ann. mycol. 9: 174. 1911). Corner (*1950:* 468) transferred this species to *Physalacria.* — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Baumaniella*": Theissen *in* Brotéria, Sér. bot. 10: 16. 1912; J. Rick *in* Egatea 16: 204. 1931, etc.—An error.

Capitoclavaria "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. 7: 1107. 1922 (not validy published); see also, Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 61. 1936. — A not validly published name: not definitely accepted by the publishing author and at the same time rather a nomen provisorium. For some general considerations on the McGinty names, see Part I of the present series (*in* Reinwardtia 1: 205. 1951). — Doty (*1948*: 126) accepted *Capitoclavaria* as validly published and legitimate (i.e. priorable), an inadmissible conclusion. This is how Lloyd (in a note to *Clavaria capitata* Lloyd) introduced the name:

"The idea, however, of a Clavaria not having the hymenium over stems or branches, but confined to terminal heads is a new one, I think, in Clavarias, hence could be made a 'new genus' (*Capitoclavaria capitata*, McGinty) . . .."—Lloyd (*l.c.*).

The species was redescribed by S. G. M. Fawcett [*in* Proc. roy. Soc. Victoria II 51: 276 *f. 1N; pl. 17 fs. 1-3, 6; pl. 20 f. 3.* 1939, as *Clavaria capitata* Lloyd; see also Corner, *1950:* 565, as *Ramaria capitata* (Lloyd) Corner].

Caripia O.K.—See "Thelephoraceae."

Ceratella Pat., Hym. d'Eur. 157. 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: ceratellum, small horn. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Pistillaria queletii* Pat.

— SCOPE. Patouillard made the pointed, sterile tip of the fruit-body the leading feature of his genus and mentioned as examples, "*C. Queletii, C. acuminata, C. aculina,* etc." — TYPIFICATION. The genus was called "*Ceratella* (Quél.)," which indicated that Patouillard had *Clavaria* sect. *Ceratella* Quél. (Ench. Fung. 222. 1886) in mind as basinym. This latter name originally covered seven species, the first of which is *Clavaria uncialis* Grev. ex Fr., the second, *Cl. mucida* (Pers.) ex Fr., and the third, *Cl. aculina* Quél. The only species of this group retained by Patouillard was *Cl. aculina;* it is hardly acceptable as the type of the 'basinym.' Quélet's description merely reads "Simplices, minutae. Lignatiles." The original description of *Cl. aculina* (Quélet, C.R. Ass. franç. Avanc. Sci. 9: 670 *pl. 8 f. 11.* 1880) states that it was found "Sur les joncs pourrissants des marais," which conflicts with one of the three words of the sectional description. Subsequent authors who retained an infrageneric taxon *Ceratella* (and at the same time accepted Patouillard's genus) excluded this fungus from Quélet's taxon. This was done, for instance, by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. de France 122. 1928), who made Quélet's taxon a subgenus of *Clavaria* Fr. and emended it in such a manner that it is rather obvious that they framed their group around another of Quélet's species, *Cl. mucida,* which growns on wood; that species is here selected as the type of *Clavaria* sect. *Ceratella* Quél. Because *Cl. mucida* was not admitted among the original species of the genus *Ceratella,* the 'basinym' is to be rejected as such and the author's citation of the generic name should become 'Pat.' rather than '(Quél.) Pat.' — Afterwards Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 49. 1900) left *Cl. aculina* out as an example and listed, "*C. aculeata* Pat., *C. Queleti* Pat., *C. Helenae* Pat., *C. macrospora* Pat., *C. acuminata* (Fckl.), etc." When Konrad & Maublanc renamed the genus, they indicated *Pistillaria queletii* Pat. = *Ceratella queletii* (Pat.) Pat. as the type species of *Ceratellopsis* Konr. & Maubl., q.v. It is one of the two species that figure among the examples listed by Patouillard both in 1887 and 1900, the other one being *Pistillaria acuminata* Fuck. This choice is accepted here for *Ceratella* Pat. — HOMONYM: *Ceratella* Hook. f. (1845; Compositae). — ISONYM: *Ceratellopsis* Konr. & Maubl. (1937), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Ceratellopsis Konr. & Maubl., Icon. select. Fung 6: 502. 1937. — ETYMOLOGY: (*Clavaria* sect.) *Ceratella; ὄψις,* appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Pistillaria queletii* Pat. — BASINYM: *Ceratella* Pat. (1887), q.v. — SCOPE. That of the genus *Ceratella* Pat. as treated by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. de France 140. 1928),

with "2 espèces," *Ceratella queletii* (Pat.) Pat. and *Ceratella helenae* (Pat.) Pat., *Pistillaria aculeata* Pat. not being definitely included.[4] However, as a mere name change of *Ceratella*, the original scope of *Ceratellopsis* is technically that of the generic basinym. — VALID PUBLICATION. *Ceratellopsis* was introduced as a "nov. nom." for *Ceratella* Pat., with a short French (and no Latin) description. There is a reference, "*Ceratella* (Quélet, p.p.), Patouillard (1887)." This is to Patouillard's description rather than to Quélet's, since 'Quélet, p.p.' stands evidently for 'Quélet, with the exclusion of the typical part,' because the authors maintained *Clavaria* sect. *Ceratella* Quél. as the correct name for a quite different group of fungi (also in Bourdot & Galzin's circumscription). The work in which *Ceratellopsis* was published contains an extensive bibliography which supplements the reference "*Ceratella* . . . Patouillard (1887)." There is no doubt that the authors introduced a new name for Patoiuillard's group. The reason for so doing seems to have been that they regarded the use of the section epithet 'Ceratella' misapplied in generic rank as inadmissible. The authors were apparently unaware of the existence of an earlier homonym. — REMARK. By indicating *P. queletii* as the type species of the isonym, Konrad & Maublanc indirectly selected it as the type of the basinym, too. It is difficult to exchange that species for another one. Corner (*1950:* 35, 36, 198, 689) preferred such a substitution and selected *Pistillaria aculeata:*

"If [*Ceratellopsis Queletii*] has the same structure as *C. aculeata* there will be no difficulty, but if it is a *Pterula*, then *Ceratellopsis* will become merely a synonym of *Pterula* and a new generic name will have to be made for *C. aculeata*. Thus I consider it preferable to change the lecto-type of *Ceratellopsis* so that the name can be used with certainty."—Corner (*1950*: 36).

This selection—unluckily—seems hardly permissible in view of the original designation of *P. queletii;* moreover *Pistillaria aculeata* Pat. is neither among the examples listed by Patouillard when he introduced his genus *Ceratella,*[5] nor is it one of the species definitely admitted by Konrad & Maublanc. (It is not one of the original species of *Clavaria* sect. *Ceratella* Quél. either.)

---

[4] "Nous avons récolté . . . une petite espèce répondant bien exactement aux descriptions de *C. acuminata* Pat. . . . et de *C. aculeata* Pat. . . . .. — Petites clavules . . . avec pointe sterile . . .. .. — A la même place, le lendemain et jours suivants, les clavules étaient bien plus nombreuses; . . . la plupart étaient obtuses au sommet, sans prolongement d'hyphes stériles . . .. Il est probable que diverses espèces de *Typhula* peuvent présenter les caractères du genre *Ceratella* dans leur jeunesse . . .. — Bourdot & Galzin *(l.c.)*.

[5] It is Patouillard's first example in 1900; see under *Ceratella*.

Chaetotyphula Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 207, 690. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: χαίτη, hair; the genus *Typhula*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Typhula hyalina* Jungh. — SCOPE. Introduced with two species.

Cladaria Ritgen. *in* Schr. Ges. Beförd. Naturw. Marburg 2: 94. 1831.[6] — ETYMOLOGY: κλάδος, branch. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. (in connection with a proposal for rejection) or *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff.

VALID PUBLICATION. The description to which this generic name owes it valid publication runs:

"Die astigen Clavarien müssen abgetheilt werden von der einfachkeulenförmigen, welches unter dem Namen *Cladaria* geschehn kann (150-153)."—Ritgen (*l.c.*).

This has not been contested as yet as ensuring the valid publication of the name.

SCOPE. Ritgen based his review of the fungi almost exclusively on Nees's "Das System der Pilze und Schwämme" (1817); like in other instances the numbers at the end of the sentence quoted above denote illustrations in that work and it must be assumed that *Cladaria* is a name introduced for the branched species of *Clavaria* as treated by Nees (*op. cit.* pp. 168 et sqq. & "Ueberblick" pp. 42-43). This makes the inadmissible denomination "Astschwämme, *Clavariae ramulosae*" (Nees, *op. cit.* p. 168) 'basinym' of *Cladaria*.[7]

Nees (*op. cit.* "Ueberblick" pp. 42-43) divided these branched species into a subdivision "Traubenstengler. *Botryoideae,*" and another one, "Zweigstengler. *Ramalinae.*" These two groups correspond to Persoon's already previously introduced two subdivisions of "A. Coralloideae: clavulis ramosis. (RAMARIA Holmsk.)," viz., Nees's first group with "Caule crassissimo," and his second with "Caule tenui s. ramis omnibus simul sumtis tenuior" (Syn. Fung. 585, 588. 1801).

Nees's examples of his '*Botryoideae*' are "*Clavaria pomacea,*" "noch unbeschrieben," followed by *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. Of his '*Ramalinae,*' he remarked, "Die reinste und edelste Form des Astschwammes stellen die Familiengenossen der *Clavaria pratensis, amethystina, corniculata* Pers.

---

[6] Rogers (*1950*: 33) concluded that the date is unquestionable 1828. From his remarks one would deduce that Ritgen's paper in question and another one by the same author were issued at this earlier date as a separate installment of the volume of which it forms part; and that these papers bear their own pagination (*Cladaria*, p. 54). The copy I had access to (British Museum, Nat. Hist.) consisted of the volume issued as a whole; both the original cover and the title-page were dated 1831.

[7] "Astschwämme, *Clavariae ramulosae*. . . . Zweyte Cattung. Stengelschwamm. (Stengler) *Clavaria.*"—Nees (*op. cit.* p. 168).

&c., mit schönerem Verhältnisse des Stamms und der oft regelmässig sich spaltende Aeste, dar"; follow the treatment with the specific descriptions (all names ascribed to Persoon), in this order, of *Clavaria amethystina*, *C. palmata*, *C. corniculata*, and, for instance, *C. cornea*, the latter already making up part of Nees's undivided species.

Nees's illustrations (as far as those cited by Ritgen are concerned) represent *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. (Nees, *pl. 16 f. 150;* copied from Schaeffer, Fung. Ic. *pl. 176*); *C. amethystina* (Holmsk.) "Pers." (Nees, *f. 151;* copied from Holmskjold, Beata rur. *pl. 28*, as *Ramaria amethystina* Holmsk. = *Clavaria* "*amathystea* . . . Holmsk. coryph. p. 110 cum ic. eleganti," of Persoon, Syn. Fung. 590); *C. palmata* "Pers." [Nees, *f. 151B;* copied from Holmskjold, *op. cit. pl. 27*, *Ramaria palmata* (Scop.) Holmsk., a different fungus from *C. palmata* Pers.]; *C. corniculata* Schaeff. (Nees, *f. 152;* copied from Schaeffer, *op. cit. pl. 173*); and *C. cornea* Batsch (Nees, *f. 153*).

TYPIFICATION. Corner (*1953*: 290) correctly remarked that, *Cladaria* "was made merely for branched species of *Clavaria* . . .. As such it is a superfluous name for *Ramaria* Holmsk. [non S. F. Gray], and I regard it as a clear synonym. Indeed the content of the genus, as evidenced by the illustrations cited by Ritgen, is that of Holmskjold." Since Nees divided his '*Clavariae ramulosae*' (which group became Ritgen's *Cladaria*) into two subdivisions, '*Botryoideae*' and '*Ramalinae*,' it follows that the most eligible species to the type are two, one representative of each of the groups. These are for '*Botryoideae*' undisputable *Clavaria botrytis* (which, for instance, inspired the name of the group in which it was placed!) and for '*Ramalinae*' rather *C. corniculata* (see below).[8]

The first author to select a type species for *Cladaria* was Doty (*1948*: 126), who proposed "*Clavaria amethystina* Fries." Some years afterwards Doty (*1950*: 12) suggested that his selection be recognized and about simultaneously Rogers (*1950*: 33) expressed as his opinion that Doty's lectotype was acceptable and "valid," and that there was no place for the substitution of an other by a subsequent author. The species in question is not an original one: Ritgen did not refer back to Fries's fungus. What Doty must have had in mind is Nees's *Clavaria amethystina* "Pers." (= *C. amathystea* Pers., a name change for *Ramaria amethystina* Holmsk.), which by Nees's description and his illustration copied from Holmskjold, is to be interpreted in accordance to Holmskjold and quite certainly not in

[8] It will be demonstrated under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray [non (Fr.) Bonord.] that Gray raised the '*Ramalinae*,' to the rank of a genus; he apparently intended to do the same for the '*Botryoideae*,' but this second genus was not included in his book.

accordance to Fries, the author to which Doty ascribed the name. Rather than suggesting that Doty proposed a non-original species (and thus did not really typify *Cladaria*), I prefer to assume that he broadly interpreted Fries's *Clavaria amethystina*, inclusive of *Ramaria amethystina* Holmsk., the latter species thus being indirectly indicated by an incorrect name.[9] Even if thus corrected, Doty's choice is not at all readily acceptable and, moreover, a very embarrassing one. Nees (*op. cit.* p. 169) regarded *C. amethystina* intermediate between his two subdivisions, reason why he mentioned it as the first example of his '*Ramalinae*': "Macht der Uebergang zu den einfachern, dünnstämmigen Arten ['*Ramalinae*']." This remark shows that this fungus is not eligible for any of Nees's two subdivisional names and should, therefore, not be ranked among the species most eligible as the type of *Cladaria*. Nees's German name for the '*Ramalinae*' is Zweigstengler (in contrast with Traubenstengler for the '*Botryoideae*'), which shows that he had in mind species with slender stems and slender branches. Holmsjold's illustration of *Ramaria amethystina* could hardly have acted as godmother. In addition, Doty had ignored that it was (and is as yet) not quite certain what either Holmskjold's or Fries's fungus really represents. Doty (cf. *1950:* 12) interpreted the species he selected in agreement with Coker, that is, as being the fungus now currently called *Clavaria zollingeri* Lév. (Corner, *1950:* 258-262 *fs. 95-98, pl. 1 fs. 1, 2*). According to Corner (*1953:* 290-291), "*Ramaria amethystina*, as illustrated and described by Holmskjold [and Nees], is probably *Clavaria zollingeri*, if one can judge from its brittle texture and manner of branching." As to *Clavaria amethystina* Fr., Corner is convinced that that name should be retained for a species of *Clavulina* J. Schroet., thus as belonging to a quite different genus. Retention of *Ramaria amethystina* Holmsk. would make *Cladaria* a potential source of much confusion. If *Cladaria* were to be typified by Doty's choice I would most likely treat it as a nomen dubium.

Donk (*1949:* 106), when still unaware of Doty's preference, selected *Clavaria corniculata* "Pers." = *C. corniculata* Schaeff.[10] This was not done without care, one of the objects being, for instance, to avoid the trap laid by *Ramaria amethystina;* the selection of that species would "make *Cladaria* virtually a nomen dubium, and a hotly debated one" (Donk, *1950:*

[9] Rogers (*1950*: 33) apparently recognized this point, too, for he stated that "Doty (p. 126) had earlier selected *Clav. amethystina* (Nees's no. 151)," which, of course, was not merely a statement of bare facts.

[10] I would have preferred *Clavaria pratensis* Pers.; this species Nees mentioned by name, but in contrast with *Clavaria corniculata* it was not separately described and illustrated. The two are currently regarded as conspecific.

10). The reason why *Clavaria botrytis* was not selected was because he thought himself bound to select from the species that Nees mentioned as representing "die reinste und edelste Form des Astschwammes." After a careful restudy of Nees's treatment I now feel that undue emphasis was laid on this taxonomic (or what we would now call, phylogenetic) rather than nomenclatorial remark, and that the less noble form of *C. botrytis* did not necessarily exclude it from being nomenclaturally eligible. Shortly afterwards, when Corner's monograph (*1950*) was published, it appeared that *Cladaria*, if typified by *Clavaria corniculata*, would become the correct name of *Clavulinopsis* Overeem as emended by Corner, a very regrettable situation. In the meantime *Clavaria corniculata* has been made the type of a new genus, *Donkella* Doty, q.v.; however, compare Corner (*1953:* 291-292) for some taxonomic remarks on this genus.

In conclusion of this review of the typification of the name *Cladaria*, I would suggest that *Clavaria botrytis* be selected as the type species (see below). If this were not done the earlier selected *Clavaria corniculata* would doubtlessly be accepted at least by some mycologists in preference of the still earlier selected, but less eligible, *Ramaria amethystina*.

HOMONYM. Presumably *Cladaria* Rafin. (1838; Rutaceae) is not to be regarded as a homonym.

TYPONYMS. With *Clavaria botrytis* as the type, *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. (1851; proposed for conservation) and *Corallium* Hahn (1883) would become typonyms; with *Clavaria corniculata*, *Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821; proposed for rejection), *Cornicularia* Bonord. (1951; preoccupied), and *Donkella* Doty, q.v.

NOMEN REJICIENDUM (proposed). Originally, before knowing how it might be typified, Donk (*1941:* 158, 178) proposed *Cladaria* for rejection against *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., q.v., and later on proposed it again for rejection, along with *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, q.v., as another nomen rejiciendum, this time specifying *C. corniculata* as the suggested type species (Donk, *1949:* 106). Rogers (*1949:* 473) thought that the proposal, in its original formulation of 1941, should be rejected, and afterwards confirmed his opinion in regard to the revised proposal (Rogers, *1950:* 33). The Special Committee for Fungi rejected it by ballot (cf. *in* Taxon 2: 31. 1953; *in* Mycologia 45: 320. 1953).

Nevertheless I herewith once more move that *Cladaria* be rejected against *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., q.v., this time with *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. as the type species. This would dispose of *Cladaria* as a priorable name altogether by making it a typonym of a conserved name, which is precisely what it deserves as a superfluous name published in ignorance of the

pre-existence of *Ramaria* Holmsk. introduced for exactly the same idea. Moreover, the resemblance between *Cladaria* and *Clavaria,* as names within one family, might lead to considerable confusion. As the taxonomic situation is at present, *Cladaria,* if typified by *Clavaria botrytis,* would endanger *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., and if typified by *Clavaria corniculata, Clavulinopsis,* the latter genus as monographed by Corner another extensive genus of no less than 63 species (combination all made!). (Doty's typification is thought to be less tenable and confusing.) Taking into consideration that *Cladaria* has as yet never been taken up and redefined (Doty has formally made one, the first and only, combination with that name without redefining the genus), there are no obstacles to reach a goal that would considerably contribute to greater stability in the nomenclature of the clavarias.

[*Cladosterigma* Pat. *apud* Pat. & Lagerh. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 8: 138. 1892. — Type species (only original species) : *Cladosterigma fusispora* Pat.—Placed by its author in Deuteromycetes (Tuberculariaceae). Von Höhnel (*in* Oester. bot. Z. 57: 323. 1907; *apud* H. & P. Sydow *in* Ann. mycol. 5: 352. 1907) assigned it to Dacryomycetineae, and it has also been referred by the same author (Von Höhnel *in* S.B. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-naturw. Kl. 128 I: 535. 1919) to *Clavaria;* he identified it (in 1919) with *Microcera clavariella* Speg. Afterwards Petch (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. 8: 212. 1923) identified it accordingly but denied its basidiomycetous nature; he classed it among "Stilbaceae."]

Clavaria L.—See under *Clavaria* Fr.

Clavaria Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 465. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: clava, club. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Clavaria fragilis* Pers. ex Fr.—This is now often considered conspecific with *Clavaria vermicularis* Fr.; see, for instance, Corner (*1950:* 252). — PROTONYM: *Clavaria* Vaill., Bot. paris. 39. 1727.—A name introduced in the Tournefortian system of nomenclature for three species, (i) *Clavaria militans, crocea* Vaill. (*pl. 7 f. 4*) = *Cordyceps militaris* (L. ex Fr.) Link, (ii) *C. alba, pistilliforme* Vaill. (*pl. 7 f. 5*), and (iii) *C. ophioglossoides, nigra* Vaill. (*pl. 7 f. 13*) = *Geoglossum sp.,* thus all undivided species, the branched ones being placed in a different genus, *Corallo-Fungus* Vaill. *Clavaria* was accepted by Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 208. 1729) and already before 1753 by Linnaeus (Gen. Pl. 327. 1737). — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Clavaria* L., Sp. Pl. 2: 1182. 1753.—In his "Genera Plantarum," Linnaeus cited Vaillant as the author of the name; he extended the genus so as to include also branched species; and in-

corporated Vaillant's three species in *Clavaria* group Indivisae. Vaillant's first species was the basis of *C. militaris* L., his second was cited under *C. pistillaris* L., and his third was the basis of *C. ophioglossoides* L. — SCOPE. Fries, who, too, ascribed his genus *Clavaria* to Vaillant, also included undivided as well as branched species; of Vaillant's species he retained one, the second, citing it as a synonym of his *Clavaria fragilis* var. b. *cylindrica* (Bull.) ex Fr. — TYPIFICATION. Donk (*1933:* 74-75) selected *Clavaria fragilis* as the type species; he was followed by Doty (*1948:* 126) and Corner (*1950:* 36, 215, 689; "Donk has chosen *C. vermicularis*"). — An earlier selection, of "*Clavaria botrytis* Pers." as the type species of "*Clavaria* (Vaill.) L. . . . 1753," by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) is to be rejected (Donk, *1949:* 116). That species was neither one of Vaillant's nor one of Linnaeus's. Moreover, it is branched, and historical considerations (for instance, excluded from *Clavaria* with the introduction of *Cladaria* Ritgen, q.v.) in combination with the meaning of the generic name require preferably an unbranched species. Further, this choice would make *Clavaria* the correct name of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. emend. Donk and would necessitate adoption of another name for the present, restricted, genus *Clavaria*. — HOMONYM: *Clavaria* Stackhouse, Nereis brit., Ed. 2, x. 1816 (Gelidiaceae, Rhodophyta; starting-point date, 1753). — "*Clavaria*" of Steudel (Nomencl. Pl. phaner. 204. 1821) is an error for *Calvaria* Gaertn. as indicated by Steudel himself (Nomencl. Pl. univ. 262, 378. 1840). — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM. Donk (*1933:* 74, footnote) drew attention to the existence of the earlier homonym and later on proposed it more explicitly for rejection (Donk, *1949:* 115-117). The same proposal was moved by Doty (*1948:* 127), and Rogers (*1949:* 436) recommended its adoption. It has been approved by ballot by the Special Committee for Fungi (cf. Code 77. 1952; *in* Mycologia 45: 315. 1953).[11]

Clavariachaeta "McGinty": Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. 7: 1111. 1922 (not validly published); see also, Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 62. 1936. — A not validly published name: not definitely accepted

[11] *Clavaria* Stackh. was also proposed for rejection against *Gelidium* Lamour. 1813 (Papenfuss *in* Madroño 9: 12. 1947). Doty (*1948*: 127) was in error when in connection with this proposal he indicated, and stated that Papenfuss proposed, as the lectotype of *Clavaria* Stackh., *Gelidium corneum* (Huds.) Lamour. Papenfuss adopted that species for *Gelidium* Lamour. in agreement with Schmitz; for *Clavaria* Stackh. no type species was indicated by him. The correct type species is *Fucus caespitosus* Stackh. = *Gelidium pusillum* (Stackh.) Le Jolis: see Donk (*1949*: 117) and Papenfuss (*in* Hydrobiologia 2: 191. 1950). This species is also synonymous with *Fucus clavatus* Lamour., which name is less correctly mentioned for the type species in the proposal as edited by Rogers.

by the publishing author. For some general considerations on the McGinty names, see Part I of the present series (*in* Reinwardtia 1: 205. 1951). Doty (*1948:* 127) accepted the name as "legitimate." When so doing he neither provided for its valid publication, nor made it clear that he definitely accepted the name as a correct one. Thus it would appear that this name has not yet been validly published. — *Clavariachaeta* was coined for *Dendrocladium peckholtii* Lloyd (*l.c.*): "A new genus could be based on it and my friend McGinty proposes *Clavariachaeta*." The type of this species is in Lloyd's herbarium. According to Killermann (after Bresadola; *in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam., 2. Aufl., 6: 150. 1928) *D. peckholtii* would perhaps be *Lachnocladium brasiliense* (Lév.) Berk. &. C.; the two are widely different however. — See also under *Dendrocladium*. — *Clavariachaete* Corner, q.v., includes the type species of the present name, but was validly published as the name of a new genus and based on a different species.

Clavariachaete Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 268, 691. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Clavaria; χαίτη*, hair. Gender: f.; names ending in -chaete are often treated as neuter. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation on p. 689): *Lachnocladium rubiginosum* Cooke. — SCOPE. Introduced with two species, the type and *Dendrocladium peckholtii* Lloyd. — REMARK. This is to be interpreted as a different, though perhaps homonymous, name from the not validly published *Clavariachaeta* Lloyd, q.v.

Clavariadelphus Donk, Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. 2: 72 1933 (*in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 22 & *in* Meded. bot. Mus. Herb. Univ. Utrecht No. 9). — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Clavaria; ἀδελφος*, brother. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Clavaria pistillaris* Fr. — SCOPE. Three species were included.

Clavariella P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 21. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Clavaria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria apiculata* Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced (with 15 species mentioned) for a part of *Clavaria* Fr., the species whether or not branched and "receptaculum tenax. Sporae ochraceae (aromnium?)." *Clavaria flava* Schaeff. ex Fr. and *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr., considered by Fries (*1874:* 666) and Karsten as leucosporous, were not included. *Clavaria pistillaris* Fr., *Clavaria ligula* Schaeff. ex Fr., *Clavaria paradoxa* P. Karst., and *Clavaria fistulosa* Holmsk. ex Fr. are among the examples and represent the unbranched element; they are the last four mentioned. Thus *Clavariella*

was clearly instituted for *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* B. *Ochrosporae* Fr. (Fries, *1874:* 670) and the first part of *Clavaria* trib. *Holocoryne* Fr. (group, "Colore mutabili, obscurato"; Fries, *1874:* 676). '*Ochrosporae*' constitute the principal part (11 examples enumerated by Karsten). First species, *Clavaria aurea,* Schaeff. ex Fr. In the following year Karsten himself (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 37: xvii, 184. 1882) excluded the unbranched species, i.e. the '*Holocoryne*' element. — TYPIFICATION. Doty (*1948:* 127) proposed *Clavaria apiculata* Fr. as the type species — REMARK. See also *Ramaria* S. F. Gray under "Nomen rejiciendum (proposed)."

Clavicorona Doty *in* Lloydia 10: 38. 1947. — ETYMOLOGY: clava, club; corona, whorl. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation); *Craterellus taxophila* Thom ("*taxophilus*"). — SCOPE. Four species were assigned to the genus.

Clavulina J. Schroet. *in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. 3 (1): 442. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: clavula, small club. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria cristata* (Holmsk.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with five species, the first of which is *Clavaria rugosa* Bull. ex Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The species indicated above was chosen by Donk (*1933:* 16), also proposed by Doty (*1948:* 129), and accepted by Corner (*1950:* 295, 689). — REMARK. Doty has shown a pronounced, and in my opinion very regrettable, aversion to *Clavulina,* one of the generic names that are currently used by the few contemporary mycologists who divide *Clavaria* into quite a number of smaller genera. Thus, he proposed species of this genus as the types of some earlier generic names which included members of *Clavulina* among their original contents, even when the species chosen were rather ineligible. For the earlier name *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, q.v., (instituted for *branched* species, as is also plainly shown by the name) he chose the least branched, and therefore about the least eligible one, *Clavulina rugosa* (Bull. ex Fr.) J. Schroet.! Normally this plant often has simple fruit-bodies! Compare also in this connection Corner (*1953:* 288-289). For *Holocoryne* Bonord., q.v., he again proposed the same species although in the original description it was mentioned clearly as an example of a somewhat aberrant group among the original ones! For *Stichoramaria* Ulbrich, too, the least branched species was proposed as lectotype, again *Clavulina rugosa.* For *Cladaria* Ritgen, q.v., he proposed a most diversely interpreted one, "*Clavaria amethystina* Fries." It would seem that in this case he meant *Ramaria amethystina* Holmsk. (*Clavaria amathystea* Pers.), which might rather be the same as *Clavaria zollingeri* Lév., but on the other hand might after all still belong to *Clavulina.* Nevertheless, I think

that *Clavulina* has survived this incomprehensible attack and still stands as the correct name for those who recognize the genus, Doty's selections for *Ramaria* S. F. Gray and *Holocoryne* being unacceptable and the one he proposed for *Cladaria* (if it has to be maintained) making the latter generic name rather a nomen dubium, if not a metonym of *Clavaria* Fr. emend. Corner. — TYPONYM: *Stichoramaria* Ulbrich (1928), and compare *Ramaria* Holmsk. (1790; devalidated name).

Clavulinopsis Overeem *in* Bull. Jard. bot. Buitenzorg III 5: 278. 1923. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Clavulina; ὄψις*, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Clavulinopsis sulcata* Overeem.—Corner (*1950:* 75, 379) reduced this name to the synonymy of *Clavulinopsis miniata* (Berk.) Corner (*Clavaria miniata* Berk.). — REMARK. If one follows Corner (*1950:* 74, 342) in his emendation of the genus (which made it a substantial group with 63 species, inclusive of *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr.), the generic name is endangered by both *Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821), q.v., and *Cladaria* Ritgen (1828), q.v. The proposal to conserve *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. (see pp. 443, 478), if accepted, would dispose of both these names!

Cnazonaria Corda *in* Sturm, Deutschl. Fl., Pilze Hft. 7: 55. 1829. — ETYMOLOGY: *κνάζον*, pin, needle. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Clavaria setipes* Grev.—This species is also known as *Typhula grevillei* Fr. and *T. candida* Fr.

Corallium Hahn, Pilzsammler 72. 1883; 3. Aufl., 150. 1903. — ETYMOLOGY: corallium, coral. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for the branched members of *Clavaria* Fr.; eight species were treated, seven of which were illustrated. The majority belong to *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. emend. Donk; the first species is "*Clavaria flava.*" — TYPIFICATION. In selecting the type species, I carefully avoid the first species (dropped in the third edition[12]) and adopt *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr. (first species in the third edition). It seems especially suitable for the type, it being an unmistakable, very well known and favourite fungus from the mycophagist's point of view, particularly emphasized in this popular booklet. Hahn's plate and description are unmistakable, too. — TYPONYM: *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. (1851), and compare *Cladaria* Ritgen.

Corallo-Fungus Vaill., Bot. paris. 41. 1727 (no generic description); Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 208. 1729. — Introduced for nine species of which

[12] When writing this I do not have the second edition at hand.

four where depicted; two of these are branched clavarias; one (*pl. 8 f. 1*) is a sterile, effused mycelium on which *Kordera* Adans. (Deuteromycetes), q.v., is based; and one (*pl. 8 f. 3*) has been identified with *Clavaria penicillata* Bull. (for which see under *Penicillaria* Chev. and *Pterula* Fr.) and is presumably also a sterile, but erect, mycelium. The two clavarias are recognizable as *Clavulina rugosa* (Bull. ex Fr.) J. Schroet. (*pl. 8 f. 2*) and *Clavulinopsis corniculata* (Schaeff. ex Fr.) Corner (*pl. 8 f. 4*). — Sometimes cited as "*Corallofungus*."

Coralloidea Roussel, Fl. Calvados, 2e Ed., 49. 1806 (devalidated name). — Introduced for the branched species of *Clavaria* L. ("*Ramaria* Holmskj." cited as a synonym), with the description: "tige charnue, rameuse, rameaux terminé en massettes." Ten original species mentioned: e.g. *Clavaria formosa* Pers. (first species), *C. cinera* Bull., *C. pyxidata* Pers. ("*pixidata*"), *C. muscoides* "Fl. dan." Clearly the same group as *Clavaria* A. Coralloideae Pers. (Syn. Fung. 585. 1801) as can be seen from the species cited and their order. — I abstain from indicating a type for this devalidated name. The preferable choice, in view of its being the same taxon as Persoon's *Clavaria* A. Coralloideae (see under *Cladaria*), would be *Clavaria botrytis* Pers., but that species was not mentioned. One might perhaps choose in its place *Clavaria formosa* Pers. — Not validly re-published.

Coralloides Tourn., Elem. de Bot. 442 *pl. 332*. 1694; Inst. 1: 564 *pl. 332*. 1700; Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 209 *pl. 88*. 1729. — Introduced for a wide variety of plants; the two depicted by De Tournefort represented branched clavarias. — Apparently never validly re-published after 1753. G. F. Hoffmann (Pl. lichen. 2: *pl. 31 f. 2, pl. 33 f. 3*. 1794) described two species of lichens under this generic name, but gave no generic description.

Cornicularia Bonord., Handb. Mykol. 166. 1851. — ETYMOLOGY: corniculum, small horn. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr. — SCOPE & TYPIFICATION. Under the caption "G[enus] *Clavaria* Vaill. / Fries Epicrisis p. 571," Bonorden divided Fries's genus into three smaller ones: *Holocoryne* (Fr.) Bonord., "*Cornicularia* Fr.," and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. The citation of Fries after the name *Cornicularia* I am unable to explain. Bonorden does not cite any species for *Cornicularia*, so a guess has to be made as to these. The poor generic description, the name coined, and the fact that other branched species were included in *Ramaria*, all make it probable that at least *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr. was intended as a member of this

genus. I selected it as the type species, hoping my assumptions to be correct. Corner (*1950:* 74, 689) adopted this choice. — HOMONYM: *Cornicularia* Achar. (1794; Parmeliaceae, Lichenes). — TYPONYM: *Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821), and compare *Cladaria* Ritgen. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Corynoides S. F. Gray.—See Dacrymycetaceae.

[*Crinula* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 493. 1821. — Type species (only original species): *Crinula caliciiformis* Fr.—This is the conidial state of *Holwaya* Sacc. (Helotiaceae, Discomycetes) according to Von Höhnel (*in* Z. Gärungsphysiol. 1: 219. 1912). It is entered here because Fries (*1874:* 681) in his last work still mentioned it among his Clavariei. — Originally called *Crinium* Fr., Novit. Fl. suec., Partic. V, Contin. 79. 1819 (n.v.).]

Dacryopsella Höhn. *in* S. B. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-nat. Kl. 124 I: 50. 1915. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Dacryopsis*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Dacryopsis typhae* Höhn.—I already pointed out before (Donk, *1933:* 101-102) that this is not a dacrymycetaceous fungus as Von Höhnel thought; compare also Martin & Fisher [*in* Univ. Iowa Stud. nat. Hist. 15 (1): 13. 1933], Nannfeldt (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. 41: 335. 1947), and Rogers (*apud* Doty, *1948:* 130). It belongs to or near *Pistillina* Quél. and may be called **Pistillina typhae** (Höhn.) Donk, *comb. nov.* (basinym, *Dacryopsis typhae* Höhn. *in* S. B. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-nat. Kl. 118 I: 290. 1909). — SCOPE. Introduced with two species.

Deflexula Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 394, 695. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: deflecto, I bend downward. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Pterula fascicularis* Bres. & Pat. — SCOPE. Introduced with five species.

Dendrocladium (Pat.) Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. 5: 870. 1919. — ETYMOLOGY: δένδρον, tree; κλάδος, branch. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Lachnocladium giganteum* Pat.—Corner (*1950:* 568) has provisionally placed this name as a synonym under *Ramaria cyanocephala* (Berk. & C.) Corner (*Clavaria cyanocephala* Berk. & C.), with the annotation "an *Ramaria Zippelii?*"

BASINYM: *Lachnocladium* sect. *Dendrocladium* Pat. *in* J. Bot. (ed. Morot) 3: 33. 1889; Essai taxon. Hym. 44. 1900.—Patouillard introduced his section with eight species. (A few more species were mentioned casually, after the enumeration of these eight representatives.) Numbers

1—3 were already previously described species; of these a few notes were given concerning the spores of each of them. Numbers 4—8 were new species and for that reason were more fully described. *Lachnocladium giganteum* Pat. (no. 6) is the one most fully illustrated; *L. insigne* Pat. (no. 7) comes next in this respect; while of *L. guyanense* Pat. (no. 8), *L. guadalupense* (Lév.) Pat. (no. 2), and *L. tubulosum* (Fr.) Sacc. (no. 1) only spores were drawn. First species, *L. tubulosum*.

SCOPE. The following quotation is Lloyd's note in which he raised Patouillard's section to generic rank:

"There occurs in the tropics a group of Clavariaceae corresponding to *Pterula* and *Lachnocladium*, but having colored spores. It was called *Lachnocladium* by Patouillard, but for me that is a perversion of the name both as to meaning and application and does not include the original species on which it was based. It includes *Phaeopterula* of Hennings. As a usual thing I hardly uphold separating genera on spore color alone in the small groups, but some of these plants are so different from *Pterula* and *Lachnocladium* in general features that there should be a genus to include them leaving out of consideration the spores. We adopt a name [*Dendrocladium*] proposed by Patouillard as a section [of *Lachnocladium*]. The following *Pterula* of Saccardo enter into this group.

"*Pterula hirsuta*, Java. Not found by me. Spores recorded as elliptical, 4 × 6—8 μ, probably smooth.

"*Phaeopterula juruensis* belongs here and also most of the species included in Patouillard's synopsis as *Lachnocladium*."—Lloyd (*l.c.*).

As can easily be seen from this quotation, *Dendrocladium* is a genus introduced for species with coloured spores, regardless of the fact whether they were smooth or roughened (as is also shown by Lloyd's later determinations). It thus matches exactly *Lachnocladium* sect. *Coniocladium* Pat. plus *Lachnocladium* sect. *Dendrocladium;* the first has its "spores ocracées pâles, lisses" (Patouillard, *l.c.*, 1889), or ". . . brunes . . ., lisses" (1900), and the second, "spores brunes, échinées ou verruqueuses" (1889) or ". . . échinulées" (1900). The conclusion that *Dendrocladium* Lloyd covers these two of Patouillard's three sections is underlined by Lloyd's own statements: ". . . belongs here and also *most of the species included in Patouillard's synopsis* [of 1889] as *Lachnocladium*" (italics are mine) and "it was called *Lachnocladium* by Patouillard . . .." Patouillard's third section (*Lachnocladium* sect. *Lachnocladium* Pat.) comprised only two species [one of these is *L. brasiliense* (Lév.) Berk. & C.], of which the spores were unknown; this seems the group to which Lloyd restricted the name *Lachnocladium* Lév. Most of the white-spored species of *Lachnocladium* were placed by Lloyd in Patouillard's 'emendation' of *Thelephora* Ehrh. ex Fr. Conclusion: *Dendrocladium* Lloyd must be considered an

isonym of *Lachnocladium* sect. *Dendrocladium*, the scope of which was extended to cover also section *Coniocladium*.

TYPIFICATION. Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 62 1936) indicated "*D. hirsutum* (P. Henn.) Lloyd" as the type species of the generic name. Doty (*1948:* 130) proposed the same species. I can't agree to this for various reasons. Lloyd's species are "most of the species included in Patouillard's synopsis as *Lachnocladium*," plus *Pterula hirsuta* P. Henn. and *Phaeopterula juruensis* P. Henn. (see quotation above). These latter two species were especially mentioned by name because they were not found in Patouillard's enumeration (being described afterwards), and also because they were taken from genera other than *Lachnocladium:* they were purely supplementary examples and not, to Lloyd, the most prominent members of his genus. These were Patouillard's, indicated collectively. Moreover, *Pterula hirsuta* was evidently not known to Lloyd except from its description. He certainly knew several other species which he did not list by name. The gist of the preceding remarks was already published by Corner (*1950:* 83) with whom I discussed these questions.

Killermann (*in* Engl. & Pr., Nat. PflFam., 2. Aufl., 6: 150. 1926) restricted "*Dendrocladium* Pat." to a single species, *Dendrocladium peckholtii* Lloyd, described 33 years after the introduction of Patouillard's section, and some years after it was raised to generic rank. In addition, Lloyd himself did not regard it as quite typical, otherwise he would not have proposed for it, under his nom de plume McGinty, the generic name *Clavariachaeta*, q.v. Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) suggested it as the type species of *Dendrocladium*.

I think that we are fully justified (or rather, obliged) to look for the type species among the true kernel of the genus: Patouillard's species of the basinym, *Lachnocladium* sect. *Dendrocladium* itself. Among these there is one in particular which stands out, and which played at least an important rôle to the author of the avowed basinym. It is the one most fully illustrated: *L. giganteum*. The type of this name has been preserved.

Dimorphocystis Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 400, 695. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: δίς, twice; μορφή, shape; κύστις, bladder. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Dimorphocystis laevis* Corner. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species.

Donkella Doty *in* Lloydia 13: 14. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: M. A. Donk. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only species mentioned): *Clavaria corniculata* [Schaeff. ex] Fr. — TYPONYMS: *Ramaria*

S. F. Gray (1821; proposed for rejection), *Cornicularia* Bonord. (1851; preoccupied), and compare *Cladaria* Ritgen.

Eoagaricus L. C. C. Krieger *in* Bull. Maryland Acad. Sci. 3: 8. 1923. — ETYMOLOGY: ἠώς, dawn; the genus *Agaricus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym): *Physalacria inflata* Peck. — BASINYM: *Physalacria* Peck (1882), q.v.:

". . . I find it necessary to transfer this much-transferred plant from its present position, in the Clavariaceae, into the Agaricaceae . . .. Its generic name I change from *Physalacria* to *Eoagaricus*."—Krieger (*l.c.*).

REMARK. A superfluous name.

Eriocladus Lév. *in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. III 5: 158. 1846. — ETYMOLOGY: ἔριον, wool; κλάδος, branch. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév.—Better known under its current name *Lachnocladium brasiliense* (Lév.) Berk. & C. — SCOPE. The genus was published with seven species when Léveillé had to list specimens of only two species in a regional enumeration. These two are *Clavaria* "*fistulosa* Fr." (no. 1; an error for *C. tubulosa* Fr.) and *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév., a new species (no. 7). Corner (*1953:* 292-295) has reviewed the original species and given important information as to their identity. — TYPIFICATION. Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) were the first to suggest a type; they selected *Clavaria furcellata* Fr. Donk (*1941:* 173; *1949:* 100) felt bound to adhere to it, not only because this was the first selection, but also because he believed that Léveillé took up an originally nameless and provisional unit of Fries's, afterwards called *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* sect. *Velutinae* Fr. (Epicr. 576. 1838). Léveillé's observation runs:

"Comme les *Merisma* [Pers.], ces Champignons sont rameux, de consistance coriace, et à surface complètement tomenteuse. Ce caractère, qui été déja saisi par le professeur Fries, le portait à croire qu'on pourrait l'employer pour en former un genre particulier, s'il se présentait, disait-il, sur plusieurs espèces."—Léveillé (*l.c.*).

Now Fries added the following comment to his description of *Clavaria furcellata*, the second species enumerated by Léveillé.

"*Clavariae* tropicae, quarum vero paucae innotuerunt, ab Europaeis hymenio velutino recedunt, quoad momentum, si in pluribus detegendis confirmetur, eas in peculiarem seriem collegit."—Fries (*in* Linnaea 5: 531. 1830).

This pre-existing taxon was originally instituted for *C. furcellata*; in 1838 *Clavaria tubulosa* was definitely added by Fries. Both are among Léveillé's original species; *C. tubulosa* was misinterpreted by him (Corner, *1953:* 292-293) and *C. furcellata* he had apparently not seen. The choice

of *C. furcellata* proved to be very unfortunate. Corner (*1953:* 293) reported that of Fries's three syntypes the only collection in the Friesian herbarium is labelled "Beyrich (Brazil, in truncis arb. putr. Octobro) *Clavaria furcellata* Roxb." Presumably, therefore, Roxburgh's collection from Guiana should be taken as the selected type specimen of *C. furcellata,* and of this, the first of the syntypes cited by Fries, its whereabouts, as well as those of the second syntype (Bourbon, Bory), are unknown. It is by no means sure that these collections are conspecific, Fries himself noting discrepancies. Corner (*in* Nature 168: 1031. 1951; *1953:* 293) identified Beyrich's specimen with *Clavaria surculus* Berk. = *Lentaria surculus* (Berk.) Corner. In view of our incomplete knowledge, *C. furcellata* not only must be held to be a nomen dubium, but also a nomen ambiguum because of its having been extensively and erroneously applied to various fungi. Fortunately Corner (see below) has pointed out that this species is not really illegible. — Singer (*in* Mycologia 36: 553. 1944) suggested another species: "The name *Lachnocladium* should be reserved for fungi of the type of *L. brasiliense,* and the latter be made the type of the genus." No reasons were given for this selection. It has been adopted by Doty (*1948:* 130-131) and, recently, by Corner, who defended it thus:

"Why did Léveillé make the genus? This is really the significant point. He had previously described three of the species [of *Eriocladus* = *Lachnocladium*] as *Thelephora,* and left three more in *Clavaria* where Fries and Berkeley had placed them. Then he came upon a new species which had characteristically tomentose sterile surfaces. It was this species, *Eriocladus brasiliensis,* which impressed him (for he had not himself seen another *Lachnocladium* sensu mihi), and which he straightaway placed in the new genus. On this species he made the generic character, and found support, as he imagined, in the opinion of Fries, one of whose species turns out to be congeneric. This is the reason why I consider, *a priori, Eriocladus brasiliensis* to be the nomenclatural type of the genus: it reflects the author's procedure."—Corner (*1953*: 295).

Type material of *E. brasiliensis* is available at Kew and in Paris (Corner *in* Nature 168: 1031. 1951); it proves that the genus has been correctly interpreted by Corner. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM (proposed). Donk (*11. cc*) proposed *Lachnocladium* Lév. for conservation in order to avoid the resurrection of the priorable basinym *Eriocladus,* rejected by Léveillé himself in the same year of its publication and never used again by anybody. It is suspected that Léveillé abandoned *Eriocladus* on account of the earlier name *Eriocladium* Lind., which according to the Code is not to be considered a homonym. This proposal, indicating *Clavaria furcellata* as the type species, was rejected by ballot of the Special Committee for Fungi (cf. *in* Taxon 2: 31. 1935; *in* Mycologia 45: 320. 1953). Acceptance would have made *Eriocladus* and *Lachnocladium* nomina dubia or

ambigua (see above) to many mycologists. Although the theoretical possibility still remains open that the probable type specimen (Roxburgh) of *C. furcellata* might represent *Lachnocladium brasiliense* or a closely related form, some authors would perhaps assume its identity with *Clavaria surculus* and thus arrive at an earlier generic name for *Lentaria* Corner, or if that species were transferred to *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. emend. Donk, at an earlier name for the latter genus! This all would be very deplorable. — A new proposal is herewith moved, this time with *Eriocladus brasiliensis* as the type species, but otherwise unaltered. — I know of no valid arguments against the conservation of *Lachnocladium* having been published. Doty was not in favour of the original proposal.

"Since [the retention of *Eriocladus*] requires no new combinations [*sic*] and affects insofar as known only one species [*sic*], there seems to be no need to conserve *Lachnocladium*. As the other species [than *L. brasiliense*] now listed under *Lachnocladium* are seemingly for the most part *Pterula* species, synonyms of *E. brasiliensis*, or species belonging to other genera, actually, unless the sense of the genus were greatly broadened [*sic*] with little emphasis being placed on the nature of the spores and the hymenial composition, because of the many *Lachnocladium* combinations that must be discarded, the name *Lachnocladium* will become confusing [*sic*]."—Doty (*in* Lloydia 11: 131. 1948).

It looks as if Doty had in mind a monotypic genus (*Eriocladus brasiliensis*) entirely his own, not yet clearly taxonomically outlined by him,[13] which he thought acceptable to everybody. Every statement in the quoted anthology of incorrect information, including the strictly personal generic concept, must be called misleading.[14] First, "unless the sense of the genus were greatly broadened," must be altered into the statement that the original concept has given rise to a very large genus, every restriction of which (apart from Doty's) left a still very considerable residue. The most drastic restriction thus far published and taking into account all described species is Corner's (*1950*): it resulted in a taxon consisting of 19 species plus 17 species incertae sedis. Even for this strongly reduced group conservation appears very much indicated! Secondly, after the introduction of *Eriocladus* no new names or recombinations have been published under this generic name as far as I am aware; the number of species published in combination with the name *Lachnocladium* is far in excess of the seven original combinations with *Eriocladus*. Of the two generic names, only *Lachnocladium* has been taken up. Thirdly, the replacement of that name by *Eriocladus* will give rise to more confusion than its retention would. *Lachnocladium* has been proposed for conservation in the first place for the benifit of mycologists

[13] Compare also under *Stelligera*.
[14] Doty's conclusion was adopted by Rogers (*1949*: 453; *1950*: 27).

with a preference for a broad generic concept, but those who do not maintain the genus in Léveillé's and Saccardo's inclusive circumscription, too, will certainly appreciate the retention of that name for the emendations. The point is, what would happen if to the Saccardoan genus the name *Eriocladus* were restored (Donk, *1950:* 9), or even to Corner's very much restricted genus. The answer is: many new combinations under *Eriocladus* (i) for the numerous species placed in the genus after the few ones originally included by Léveillé and still retained in it, and (ii) for the many doubtful species that would have to be transferred to *Eriocladus* because they are not yet referable to other genera. This would be a senseless creation of new combinations. Lastly, Doty's last argument also conflicts with the spirit of the Code, which emphatically forbids the rejection of names of much restricted genera like *Agaricus* and *Polyporus*.

Gliocoryne Maire *apud* Guinier & Maire *in* Bull. Soc. bot. France 55: cxxi. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, sticky substance; κορύνη, club. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Clavaria uncialis* Grev. ex Fr.—It seems likely that Maire interpreted Greville's and Fries's fungus correctly.

Hericium Fr. 1825, not *Hericium* Pers. ex S. F. Gray 1821, type species, *Hydnum hystrix* (Pers.) ex Fr., with fruit-bodies supposed to be erect, will be treated with "Hydnaceae."

Heringia Schw.—See "Thelephoraceae."

[*Hirsutella* Pat. *in* Rev. mycol. 14: 67. 1892 (original description reproduced by Speare *in* Mycologia 12: 62. 1950).[15] — Type species: *Hirsutella entomophila* Pat. — This genus is not a basidiomycetous one; it belongs to those Deuteromycetes (Moniliales) that represent imperfect Ascomycetes; compare Speare (*op. cit.* pp. 62-76). Often classed, even to-day among "Clavariaceae."]

Holocoryne (Fr.) Bonord., Handb. Mykol. 166. 1851. — ETYMOLOGY: ὅλος, entirely; κορύνη, club. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria falcata* Pers. ex Fr.[16]—Often called *Clavaria acuta* Fr. — BASINYM: *Clavaria* sect. *Holocoryne* Fr., Epicr. 573. 1838.—Bonorden indicated explicitly that the "G[enus] *Clavaria* Vaill. / Fries Epicrisis p. 571" was divided by him into three smaller genera: *Holocoryne* (Fr.) Bonord., "*Cornicularia.* Fr.," and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. — SCOPE. Bonorden did not list species for

[15] And compare *in* Grevillea 21: 47. 1892.

[16] As to this species, compare also Malençon (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 68: 304. 1953).

these genera and one has to turn to the cited work of Fries for them. There is one exception. Of *Holocoryne* one species was mentioned: "*Holocoryne.* Fr. / *Clavaria* im engern Sinne; hat ein keuliges, selten ästiges Stroma . . .. Einzelne Arten haben ein ästiges Stroma, hier sind die Aeste aber stets keulenförmig, z.B. *Clavaria rugosa.*" — TYPIFICATION. It is evident that *C. rugosa* Bull. ex Fr. was mentioned as an example of an aberrant group within the genus, rather than as a typical representative of it! Though it is the only species mentioned, it is here left out of further consideration. The remark (Doty *1948:* 129, sub *Clavulina*) that "Bonorden even listed *Clavaria rugosa* as typical species" is obviously not doing justice to the facts. It is now often included in *Clavulina* J. Schroet. [*Holocoryne* was listed before (Donk, *1933:* 74) as a synonym of *Clavaria* Fr. and not of *Clavulina.*] — As delimited in the description by Bonorden, his genus *Holocoryne* represents "*Clavaria* im engern Sinne," that is, the unbranched species in general. It equals *Clavaria* sect. *Holocoryne* plus *Clavaria* sect. *Syncoryne* Fr. So the attention is drawn at once to the type species of *Clavaria, C. fragilis* Fr. That species, however, belongs to section *Syncoryne* which is not the name-bringing one. It is, therefore, passed over here and a species of section *Holocoryne* is selected (also as the type of *Clavaria* sect. *Holocoryne* Fr.). In choosing *Clavaria falcata* Pers. ex Fr., Fries's first few species were carefully avoided. These were excluded by Karsten [*in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9) : 21. 1881] and transferred to *Clavariella* P. Karst., q.v. They are now often considered members of *Clavariadelphus* Donk. Corner (*1950:* 36, 39, 689) adopted this choice, calling the species *Clavaria acuta* Fr. of which *C. falcata* is regarded as a synonym. — TYPONYM. *Clavaria falcata* Pers. ex Fr. sensu Juel, the type species of *Stichoramaria* Ulbrich, q.v., is a different species from *C. falcata* as currently interpreted.

Hormomitaria Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 410, 696. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: ὅρμος, necklace; μίτος, thread. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species, and by original designation on p. 689): *Hormomitaria sulphurea* Corner.

Hypolyssus "Berk."—See "Thelephoraceae."

Lachnocladium Lév. *in* Orb., Dict. univ. Hist. nat. 8: 487. 1846[17]; Consid. mycol. 108. 1846. — ETYMOLOGY: λαχνός, sheep's wool; κλάδος,

[17] One often finds 1846 cited as the date; Pfeiffer gives 1849. The copy from Wageningen I recently consulted bears both 1846 and 1847, the first date being the one given on the title-page, the second, on the cardboard cover.

branch. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym): *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév. — BASINYM: *Eriocladus* Lév. (1846), q.v. — VALID PUBLICATION. *Lachnocladium* was introduced in the most summary manner acceptable: "*Lachnocladium*, Lév. = *Eriocladus*, Lév." Compare Donk (*1949:* 100). — REMARK. Streinz (Nomencl. Fung. 265, 346. 1862) listed "*Lachnobolus brasiliensis* Lév. in sched." as a synonym of *Eriocladus brasiliensis* Lév., at the same time ascribing the generic name *Lachnobolus* to Fries; the latter generic name has nothing to do with Clavariaceae. Moreover, Streinz (*op. cit.* p. 346) did not enumerate Léveillé's generic isonym itself, but in place of it he listed "*Lachnocladium* Berk." with a single species, *L. hookeri* Berk. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM (proposed). See under *Eriocladus*.

Lentaria Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 437, 696. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: lentus, pliant. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Clavaria surculus* Berk. — SCOPE. Introduced with 12 species.

Manina Adans., Fam. des Pl. 2: 5. 1763 (devalidated name). — Type species (selected): *Coralloides sp.* Mich. *pl. 88 f. 2.*—For this plant Persoon coined the name *Clavaria ignea* Pers.; it might belong to *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. emend. Donk. — As has been remarked:

"Adanson published the name citing in connection herewith '*coralloides* Micheli *Pl. 88. f. 2 and 6.*' [18] Micheli's genus as shown both by his description and figures was undoubtedly the branched forms of our modern genus *Clavaria*. Adanson's genus, therefore, . . . would properly belong to the family of the Clavariaceae . . .."—Banker (*in* Mycologia 4: 271. 1912).

The original species presumably represent members of *Clavulinopsis* Overeem, *Ramaria, Clavulina* J. Schroet., and *Gymnosporangium* Hedw. f. ex Lam. & DC. The first species cited by Adanson (Mich., *pl. 88 fig 2*) is here quite arbitrarily designated as the type species. For none of the indicated species Micheli reported an Italian name that might have been the source of Adanson's generic name ("*Manina.* Ital."). — Although Adanson did not adopt Linnaeus's binomial system of nomenclature, his generic names for fungi would have been regarded as validly published, if the starting-point date for these plants had remained 1753 (devalidated name). The name has not been validly re-published in its original sense. — *Manina* Banker (1912), q.v., is a genus of "Hydnaceae."

Martela Adans.—See *Martella* Adans. ex O.K.

[18] Correctly: "*Coralloides* Mich. t. 88. f. 2 à 6."

Martella Endl. 1836, not *Martella* Adans ex O.K. 1898, type species, *Martella echinus* Scop. = *Hydnum echinus* (Scop.) ex Fr., with fruit-bodies supposed to be erect, will be treated with "Hydnaceae."

Martella Adans. ex O.K. 1898, not *Martella* Endl. 1836, type species, *Agaricum sp.* Mich. *pl. 64 f. 1* = *Hericium hystrix* Pers., with fruit-bodies supposed to be erect, will be treated with "Hydnaceae."

Masseeola O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. 2: 859. 1891. — ETYMOLOGY: G. E. Massee. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Sparassis crispa* (Wulf.) ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Sparassis* Fr., q.v., which is by some authors considered to be preoccupied by *Sparaxis* Ker-Gawl. — VALID PUBLICATION. *Masseeola* owes its valid publication to a reference: "*Sparassis* Fries 1819 . . .. Die Arten sind nach Saccardo syll. VI 690/1 von *Sparassis* übertragen." The date "1819" refers to Fries's "Novitatiae," cited under *Sparassis* in the present paper. The application of *Masseeola* by Donk (*1933:* 70) is accompanied by a description.

[*Matruchotia* Boul. *in* Rev. gén. Bot. 5: 401. 1893. — Type species (only original species): *Matruchotia varians* Boul.—There can be little doubt that this is an imperfect fungus of somewhat clavarioid appearance (just as *Hirsutella* Pat. with which it has been combined). Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 11: 27. 1924) "is disposed to regard *Matruchotia* as a genus of the 'Stilbaceae.' " Some years later Gäumann (Vergl. Morph. Pilze 506. 1926) placed *Hirsutella,* inclusive of *Matruchotia,* in Corticiaceae; and J. Rick (*in* Brotéria, Sér. Ci. nat. 3: 77. 1934) treated *Matruchotia* as a member of Thelephoraceae.]

Merisma Hill.—See under *Merisma* Pers. ex S. F. Gray.

Merisma Pers. *ex* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 653. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: μερίς, portion, part. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Merisma foetidum* Pers. = *Thelephora palmata* (Scop.) ex Fr., according to Persoon himself (Mycol. europ. 1: 155. 1822). — PROTONYM: *Merisma* Hill, Gener. nat. Hist. 2: 60. 1751.—It is likely that Persoon borrowed the name from J. Hill, who coined it for the branched clavarias (and other fungi of similar appearance) in general. However, Persoon gave it a new meaning; the true branched clavarias he included in *Clavaria* Vaill. ex L.; he did not refer to Hill. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Merisma* Pers., Tent. 74. 1797; Comm. Fung. clavaef. 92. 1797; Syn. Fung. 582. 1801.— In the first publication cited Persoon did not mention any species. In the next one ten species were definitely included, among which were *Merisma foetidum* Pers. (first species) and *M. cristatum* Pers. — SCOPE,

When Gray re-published this generic name, his species were the two just mentioned by name, *Merisma cristatum* coming first. — TYPIFICATION. I fully underline the following quotation:

> Since the first of Gray's species "is probably the same as *Sebacina incrustans* (Pers. ex Fr.) Tul. (cf. Burt, Missouri Bot. Gard. Ann. 2: 752. 1915; Bourd. & Galz., Hym. Fr. 231. [1928]), to adopt it as the type would make necessary either discarding the generic name *Sebacina* Tul. or conserving *Sebacina*, [1871], against *Merisma*. Therefore *M. foetidum* is hereby designated as the lectotype of *Merisma* Pers. ex Gray. . . . *M. foetidum* is probably the same as *Thelephora palmata* [Scop.] Fr. . . . To avoid possible nomenclatorial complexities that might arise from the existence of *Thelephora* trib. *Merisma* [Pers.] Fr., Syst. Myc. 1: 432. 1821, *T. palmata* [Scop.] Fr. is hereby designated the lectotype of that Friesian tribe."—Rogers (*in* Mycologia 36: 77. 1944). The square brackets are as in the original.

Doty (*1948:* 132), too, proposed *Merisma foetidum* as the type species. It may be remarked in this connection that Karsten [*in* Rev. mycol 3 (No. 9) : 23. 1881] emended and restricted *Merisma* Pers. to the branched, *Clavaria*-like species of *Thelephora* Ehrh. ex Fr. (the latter genus in the present current delimitation) ; one of his three examples is *Th. palmata.* — REMARKS. Shortly after Gray the name was also re-published by Persoon himself (Mycol. europ. 1: 155. 1822). — *Merisma* was temporarily taken up by Léveillé (*in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. III 5: 157. 1846) in a circumscription rather closely agreeing with that of *Pterula* Fr. — HOMONYM: *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. (1878; "Polyporaceae").

[*Microcera* Desm. *in* Ann. Sci. nat., Bot. III 10: 359. 1848. — Type species (only original species) : *Microcera coccophila* Desm. — This genus is non-basidiomycetous and belongs to Deuteromycetes (Tuberculariaceae). It is mentioned here because Fries (*1874:* 689) listed it among his Clavariei.]

Mucronella Fr.—See "Hydnaceae."

Mucronia Fr.—See "Hydnaceae."

Myxomycidium Mass. *in* Kew Bull. 1899: 179. ?1901. — ETYMOLOGY: *μύξα*, mucus; *μυκίδιον*, small fungus. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species) : *Myxomycidium pendulum* Mass.

Parapterulicium Corner *in* Ann. of Bot. II 16: 285. 1952. — ETYMOLOGY: *παρά*, next to; the genus *Pterulicium*. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation) : *Parapterulicium subarbusculum* Corner. — SCOPE. Introduced with two species.

[*Penicillaria* Chev., Fl. Paris 1: 111. 1826. — Type species (only original species) : *Clavaria penicillata* Bull.—This species has dropped

out of current literature; it is doubtful whether it represents a (perfect state of a) basidiomycete at all. It may well be based on a sterile mycelium (Deuteromycetes), and in this case *Penicillaria* would be a nomen anamorphosis. See also under *Pterula!* Corner (*1950:* 689), evidently by error, listed *Pterula multifida* Fr. as the type species of *Penicillaria.* — Typonym: *Pterula* Fr. (1821; nomen provisorium; not *Pterula* Fr. 1825), q.v. — Homonym: *Penicillaria* Willd. (1809; Gramineae). — Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.]

Perona "Fr."—See "Thelephoraceae."

Phacorhiza Pers., Mycol. europ. 1: 192. 1822. — ETYMOLOGY: φακός, lentil; ῥίζα, root. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Phacorhiza sclerotioides* Pers. = *Typhula sclerotioides* (Pers.) Fr.—The author emphatically stated that this was not *Clavaria sclerotioides* DC. = *Pistillaria sclerotioides* (DC.) ex Fr. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Phacorrhiza*": Brongn. *in* Dict. Sci. nat. 33: 575. 1824; Fr., Elench. 1: 236. 1828 (in synonymy); Ainsworth & Bisby, Dict. Fungi, 2d Ed., 235. 1945; etc. — *Phacoriza* Grev., Scot. crypt. Fl. 1: pl. 43. 1823.—A misprint occurring once, the name in other instances being spelled *Phacorhiza.*

Phaeoaphelaria Corner *in* Ann. of Bot. II 17: 357. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Aphelaria.* Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Phaeoaphelaria australiensis* Corner.

Phaeocoryne Clem.—See *Phaeoclavulina.*

Phaioclavulina.—See *Phaeoclavulina.*

Phaeoclavulina W. Brinkm. *in* Jber. westfäl. ProvVer. Wiss. Kunst, Bot. Sect. 25: 197. 1897. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Clavulina.* Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES: (only original species): *Phaeoclavulina macrospora* W. Brinkm. — REMARK. In an "attempt to anchor the genus to a well-known species that seems to preserve the original author's conception of the genus," Doty (*1948:* 132) proposed *Clavaria broomei* Cotton & Wakef. as the type species. Such a procedure seems unwarranted. *Clavaria broomei* has been identified with *Clavaria nigrescens* W. Brinkm. (name not validly published by Brinkmann).[19] — ISONYM & VARIANT SPELLING: *Phaeocoryne* Clem. *in* Univ. Stud. Nebraska 3 (1): 72. 1902.—

[19] In Bresadola's herbarium (now at Stockholm) is a collection from Westphalia marked *Clavaria nigrescens* Brinkmann. Coker (Clav. U.S. and Can. 187. 1923) identified it with *Clavaria broomei.* I made the slip in calling the fungus "*Ramaria nigrescens* (Brinkm.) Donk comb. nov. (= *Clavaria Broomei* Cotton et Wakef.)" (Donk *1933*: 104). Coker ascribed four-spored basidia to *Clavaria broomei,* while *Phaeoclavulina* was introduced for two-spored species, as the brown-spored counterpart of *Clavulina* J. Schroet.

A name change introduced for linguistic reasons as follows: "*Phaioclavulina* = *Phaeocoryne* (φαιός, dusky, κορύνη, ἡ, club)." This isonym is apparently not validly published as not even the author's citation of the basinym was given. One might perhaps consider the new name to be accompanied by a valid description represented by the etymological explanation, but I refuse to confuse the etymology of a name with a description.[20] — Note the error in the spelling of the basinym.

Phaeopterula (P. Henn.) Sacc. & D. Sacc. *in* Sacc., Syll. 17: 201. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dusky; the genus *Pterula*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Pterula hirsuta* P. Henn. — BASINYM: *Pterula* subgen. *Phaeopterula* P. Henn. *in* Warb., Monsunia 1: 9. 1899.—This subgenus was introduced for one species, *Pterula hirsuta* P. Henn., which, therefore, is the type of the subgeneric name: "*Pterula* Fries. . . . Bezüglich der hell-bräunlichen Sporen und Pubescenz stellt [*Pt.* (*Phaeopterula*) *hirsuta* P. Henn.] eine neue Untergattung, *Phaeopterula*, dar."—Hennings (*l.c.*). — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Hennings himself never validly published the generic name. A few years after the introduction of the subgeneric name, the same author (Hennings *in* Hedwigia 43: 175. 1904) described a second species, this time under the specific name *Phaeopterula juruensis* P. Henn., and only casually mentioning the earlier species ("Von *Ph. hirsuta* P. Henn. ist die Art ganz verschieden . . ."). No generic caption or description and not even a reference to the already published subgeneric name and description were given. The generic name was not properly established until Saccardo & D. Saccardo (*l.c.*) furnished a description when adopting *Phaeopterula* as a genus, including both species already mentioned; author's citation, "P. Hennings." I don't see why Saccardo should be credited with having "inadvertently" validly published *Phaeopterula*, as has been remarked by Doty (*1948:* 133). — TYPIFICATION. As the type species of the generic isonym that of its basinym, *Pterula hirsuta*, must be appointed; it was already suggested for "*Phaeopterula* Henn. . . . 1904" by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) and also proposed by Doty (*l.c.*).

Phaeotyphula P. Henn. *in* Bot. Jb. 28: 320. 1901 (provisional name). — This name was introduced as a provisional one (and hence not validly published) in an observation under *Typhula phaeosperma* P. Henn.:

"Die Sporen sind braun, so dass die Art mit keiner der beschriebenen Arten übereinstimmt, vielleicht besser als eine Gattung *Phaeotyphula* abzutrennen sein dürfte."—Hennings (*l.c.*).

[20] See also under *Podostrombium* Kunze ("Thelephoraceae") for a discussion on a similar case.

I do not know of a valid publication of it.

Physalacria Peck *in* Bull Torrey bot. Cl. 9: 2. 1882 (reproduction of description and figure *in* Rev. mycol. 4: 127 *pl. 26 f. 13.* 1882). — ETYMOLOGY: φυσαλλίς, bladder; ἄκρα, top. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Physalacria inflata* Peck.—This species was published as a new one. Therefore, *Mitrula inflata* Schw. should not be taken as its basinym although it is usually considered conspecific. — ISONYM: *Eoagaricus* L. C. C. Krieger, q.v., a superfluous name.

Pistillaria Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 496. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: pistillum, pestle. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Pistillaria micans* (Pers.) ex Fr. or *P. quisquiliaris* (Fr.) ex Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with seven species. Of these the author indicated to have seen freshly collected specimens of *Pistillaria micans* (Pers.) ex Fr. (first species), *P. quisquiliaris,* and *P. pusilla* Pers. ex Fr.; of the other ones he saw dried specimens of *P. ovata* (Pers.) ex Fr., *P. muscicola* (Pers.) ex Fr. (genus *Eocronartium* Atk., Auriculariaceae), and *P. diaphana* (Schum.) ex Fr.; *P. sclerotioides* (DC.) ex Fr. he knew only from its description. — TYPIFICATION. Several years ago now Donk (*1933:* 101-102) emended *Pistillaria* rather drastically, retaining in it, of the original species, only *P. quisquiliaris* (selected as the type; reasons stated). Perhaps, a restatement of the facts may be useful. The principal argument lies in the emphasis on the nature of the context given in the generic description of the genus from 1835 onwards by the author himself. Compare: "ceraceo-corneus homogeneus" (Fries, Fl. scan. 340. 1835); ". . . ceraceo-corneus, induratis . . . substantia primo molli, subcarnosa" (Fries, Epicr. 586. 1838); "*Pistillaria* quasi Tremellina indurata" (Fries, Epicr. 588); "Fungi e ceraceo cornei, rigentes" (Fries, *1874:* 13), ". . . sicca indurata . . ." (Fries, *1874:* 686). The only original species known to Fries from material when establishing the genus that really meets these requirements is *Pistillaria quisquiliaris.* Compare Donk (*l.c.*; translated): "The fruit-bodies are membranous when fresh with soft contents; after drying, however, the nucleus is cartilagineous and remains tough even after prolonged soaking." *Pistillaria quisquiliaris* was the first of the species described by Fries (Obs. mycol. 2: 294. 1818, under *Clavaria*). Doty (*1948:* 133) proposed the same species. It may be pointed out that shortly after the publication of *Pistillaria,* Greville excluded in a general manner all sclerotia-producing species from *Pistillaria* (and *Typhula* Fr. as well), referring them to *Phacorhiza* Pers.:

". . . Proceeding upon the above grounds, I have extended Persoon's new genus [*Phacorhiza*], and included all those *Clavariae* which have so singular a character as

the *radicular tuber*,—surely a more striking distinction than a slight variation in the form of the *hymenium*. The fructification is similar in the whole.

"Fries has formed several genera of *Clavaria*, on which future observations will be made. His *Typhula* and *Pistillaria* contain plants which I consider as coming more naturally under *Phacorhiza*."—Greville (Scot. crypt. Fl. 1: text to pl. 43. 1823).

Since no sclerotia of *P. quisquiliaris* had been reported at that time (they are hidden in the fern-stalks), one may conclude that Greville did not exclude it from *Pistillaria*. Of course, this argument may also be used the other way round. — Attention has to be drawn to an earlier selection. Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) suggested *Pistillaria micans*, which does not become really typically horny upon drying (transferred by Donk to *Cnazonaria* Corda). Perhaps, this fungus contributed the words "Sporidia emergentia" of the original generic description. Corner (*1950:* 99) is not in favour of *P. quisquiliaris* because he does not like the consequences; he transferred it to *Typhula* Fr., in view of its sclerotium, and shrinks back from the acceptance of the name *Cnazonaria* Corda for what he continues to call *Pistillaria* (a step already taken by Donk). His choice would rather be: "Lecto-type: *P. pusilla* or *P. micans* . . ." (*op. cit.* p. 473) and, of these two species, he evidently preferred *P. micans* (*op. cit.* p. 689). Compare also Corner (*in* Nature 168: 1031. 1951). I find it difficult to make up my mind in this matter. — TYPONYM. Compare *Scleromitra* Corda (1829), based on a species (*Pistillaria coccinea* Fr.) which is now currently identified with *Pistillaria micans*.

Pistillina Quél. *in* C.R. Ass. franç. Avanc. Sci. (Reims) 9: 671. 1880 (reprint: '10e Suppl., p. 11. 1880).[21] — ETYMOLOGY: pistillum, pestle. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Pistillina hyalina* Quél.

Podostrombium Kunze.—See "Thelephoraceae."
Podostromium.—See *Podostrombium*.
Podostrumbium.—See *Podostrombium*.

Polyorus.—See *Polyozus*.

Polyozus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. 3 (No. 9): 22. 1881 (as *Polyorus*). — ETYMOLOGY: πολύς, many; ὄζος, branch. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Thelephora contorta* P. Karst. = *Merisma tuberosum* Grev. (Scot. crypt. Fl. 3: text to pl. 178. 1825) ex Fr. (Elench. 1: 167. 1828). — REMARK. *Polyozus* is included in this enumeration because only holobasidia have been reported for several collections of its type species,

[21] It is possible that the correct date of publication is 1881. The "Revue mycologique" (4: 64. 1882) mentions Quelét's paper in its issue of January 1, 1882. It reproduces the original description.

and the plant has been classified accordingly. In the European collections studied by me the basidia shade—in varying degree—into basidia which are rather similar to those of Tremellaceae (the variation occurring in the hymenium of one fruit-body); this remarkable phenomenon was first recorded by Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 82. 1928, as *Thelephora contorta* P. Karst.). Apart from the plasticity of the basidia, this species is, I believe, also reminescent of *Tremellodendron* in some other features. — STANDARD SPELLING. The original spelling "*Polyorus*" is doubtlessly an unintentional (typographical) error as becomes clear from Karsten's subsequent use of the name. — HOMONYM: *Polyosus* Lour. (1790; Rubiaceae), also spelled *Polyozus* (by Willdenow and Wittstein). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Pseudotyphula Corner *in* Ann. of Bot. II 17: 366. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ψευδής, false; the genus *Typhula*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Pseudotyphula ochracea* Corner. — SCOPE. Introduced with two species.

Pteridium Clem.—See *Pterula*.

Pterula 1821 (nomen provisorium).—See *Pterula* Fr. 1825.

Pterula Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 90. 1825; *in* Linnaea 5: 531. 1830. — ETYMOLOGY: πτερόν, feather. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria plumosa* Schw. — SCOPE. When *Pterula* was validly published in 1825 Fries indicated the contents of the genus as "S. M. I, p. 496 in obs. — Speciebus adde: *Pter. plumosam* Schw. Car. n. 1089, sub *Clav.*" The reference to his "Systema" covers *Clavaria penicillata* Bull. ["(Altera species *C. penicillata* Schum. l.c. atrofusca.)"]. Thus, the contents in 1825 consisted at least of *Clavaria penicillata* Bull. and *C. plumosa* Schw. — PROTONYM: *Pterula* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 464, 496. 1821 (nomen provisorium).—Fries already published the name *Pterula* before 1825. On page 464 one will find the remark, "*Clavaria penicillata* Bull. est typus novi generis (*Pterula*) . . ."; no description. On page 496, *Clavaria penicillata* Bull. is mentioned (with description) under its original name in small type, as a species Fries was not yet able to place with confidence, with the designation "genus inquirendum." It is currently believed that in 1821 *Pterula* was published merely as a provisional name as it was not definitely accepted by the author on that occasion. — TYPIFICATION. Doty (*1948:* 133), Donk (*1949:* 145-146), and Rogers (*1950:* 32) concluded that when the generic name was validly published in 1825, the reference to the previous publication of the name, where *C. penicillata* was the only 'original'

species, made it sufficiently clear that that species had to be taken as the type. Corner (*1953:* 295-297) convincingly pointed out the fallacy of this conclusion and I now agree with him that the correct type species should be *C. plumosa,* Fries's second species of 1825. — Fries only knew *C. penicillata* from Bulliard's description and illustration and, with it hesitated to establish the genus in 1821 ("genus inquirendum") and decided to introduce it definitely (in 1825) only after he became acquainted with *Clavaria plumosa* Schw., for which he made the new combination straightaway, while he did not at that time do the same for *C. penicillata.* Of the two syntypes of 1825 the former was undoubtedly the more important fungus to the author at that time and *Clavaria penicillata* "the dubious and discordant element that caused Fries to alter his mind twice, and finally to establish *Pterula* as a genus of Hymenomycetes by excluding *P. penicillata*" (Corner *1953:* 297). In 1830 Fries (*l.c.*) made the combination *Pterula penicillata* (Bull. ex Fr.) Fr., but already in 1832 [Syst. mycol. 3 (2) : 285], when reducing *Pterula* in rank to *Anthina* subgen. *Pterula* (Fr.) Fr., he listed *P. penicillata* as doubtfully belonging to this taxon, mentioning that it might be a true *Anthina,* such as *A. flammea* (Jungh.) ex Fr. From this publication it also becomes clear that he studied De Schweinitz's species from dried material and we may assume that it was sent to him by its author himself. Still later *P. penicillata* was defintely excluded:

"Ad unicum hujus generis [= *Pterulae*] typum europaeum (*Pt. subulata* Fries in Linn. 1830; dubie enim addita *Clav. ornithopodioides* Bull. est vera *Anthina!*) accedunt multae exoticae: *Pt. (Clavar.) Merismatoides.* Schw.! . . ., *Pt. (Clav.) tenax* Schw. . . ., *Pt. (Clav.) dendroides* Jungh. . . . et plures novae, *Pt. capillaris* etc."—Fries (Summ. Veg. Scand. 2: 339. 1849).

In connection with this quotation it must be remembered that *Clavaria plumosa* was described from North America and that *'Clav. ornithopodioides* Bull.' is an error for *'Corallo-Fungus croceus, ornithopoidioides* Vaill., *Clavaria penicillata* Bull.' Finally, in his last work when treating the European species of the genus, Fries (*1874:* 681) did not even mention *P. penicillata!*

"At the hands of Fries the genus has evolved from *P. plumosa,* through [the two European species added in 1830 and 1863], embracing numerous exotic, or tropical species. The types of these three species are in the Friesian herbarium, and I have been able to examine them . . .. All three are congeneric in the sense of *Pterula* as I have used in my monograph, following the customary Friesian tradition. *P. plumosa* is the earliest species and was for five years the only binomial in the genus. It must, therefore, be the type and lectotype in the modern nomenclatorial sense."—Corner (*1953*: 297).

Donk (*1949:* 146) already proposed *Clavaria plumosa* as the type species of "*Pterula* Fries 1830" (see below). — Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) suggested *Pterula multifida* Fr. as the type species. It is unacceptable, being added to genus as late as 1863. — At first Corner (*1950:* 118, 502, 689) considered *Pterula subulata* Fr. the type species, but on page 523 he remarked under *P. subulata:* "chosen as the type-species. It may be advisible to change the type of *Pterula* to *P. plumosa.*" — REMARK. When still convinced that *Clavaria penicillata* had to be taken as the type species, Donk (*1949:* 145-146) proposed the conservation of *Pterula* sensu Fr. 1830 (type species, *Clavaria plumosa*) against *Pterula* Fr. 1825 (type species, *Clavaria penicillata* Bull.).[22] The reason for this was that with *C. penicillata, Pterula* would be a nomen dubium, if not a nomen anamorphosis and that, therefore, modern mycology be deprived of the name of a considerable genus of Hymenomycetes. There is every reason to believe (as Fries did in 1849) that *C. penicillata* is based on an imperfect fungus (sterile mycelium) and with this species as the type, *Pterula* would be unacceptable to most mycologists. Rogers (*1950:* 32) concluded that the proposal should be rejected because he thought that conservation of later applications of a name were inadmissible, an opinion he had to withdraw on a legal basis (Rogers, *1950a*), although he still does not favour this kind of conserved names.[23] In view of the altered typification defended by Corner and accepted above, I, herewith, withdraw the proposal, feeling that the current appication of the name has been put on a secure base. — ISONYM: *Pteridium* Clem. *in* Univ. Stud. Nebraska 3 (1) : 73. 1920.—Introduced as a correction, as follows: "*Pterula* = *Pteridium*"—nothing else. Since not even the author of *Pterula* was cited, this isonym has, I believe, to be regarded as not validly published. It would in any case be a later homonym of *Pteridium* Scop. (1760; Filicales; nomen conservandum).

Pterulicium Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 536, 699. 1950. — ETYMOLOGY: The genus *Pterul(a);* the genus *((Cort)icium.* Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species, and by original designation on p. 689) : *Clavaria xylogena* Berk. & Br.

[22] Compare *Penicillaria* Chev. (1826).

[23] Dr. D. P. Rogers in his function of Secretary of the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon 2: 29. 1953, *in* Mycologia 45: 313. 1953) excluded the proposal from a trial because he classed it with those proposals for conservation of a name that would be retained without conservation against the nomina rejicienda proposita. He never explained on what grounds *Pterula* [sensu] Fr. 1830 could by any change be the correct name against *Pterula* Fr. 1825; and I am unable to inform the reader about them either.

Ramaria Holmsk. (devalidated name).—See under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray.

Ramaria Rafin.—See under *Ramaria* Holmsk.

Ramaria S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 655. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: ramus, branch. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Clavaria pratensis* Pers. = *C. corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr.—If a type specimen had to be indicated it would be the type of *C. pratensis*, preserved in Persoon's herbarium at Leyden, where I studied it.

SCOPE. Gray deliberately restricted the name *Ramaria* Holmsk. to only a part of the branched clavarias as is testified by his species and in particular by his generic description which reads:

"*Thallus* fleshy, cylindrical, branched, generally pipey, below slender; *sporidia* scattered on the upper parts of the thallus."—Gray (*l.c.*). Spacing is mine.

His genus rather compares with Persoon's second subdivision of the branched clavarias, "Caule tenui s. ramis omnibus simul sumtis tenuior," and with Nees's *Clavariae ramulosae* group *Ramalinae*, discussed under *Cladaria* Ritgen, q.v.! He apparently wanted to exclude from this emendation Persoon's first subdivision of the branched clavarias, which corresponds with Nees's *Clavariae ramulosae* group *Botryoideae*. For some reason this second taxon (inclusive of *Clavaria botrytis* Pers.) did not find a place in Gray's book. That author had two bibles in relation to Fungi, Persoon's "Synopsis" (1801) and Nees's "Das System der Pilze und Schwämme" (1817)[24] and it is quite clear how he arrived at his conception of *Ramaria*, the name of which he found cited by Persoon (Syn. Fung. 585. 1801), who headed the branched clavarias thus: "A. Coralloideae: clavulis ramosis. (RAMARIA Holmsk.)." Gray's eight (British) species confirm his generic description. This conclusion is at variance with Corner's (*1953*: 287), who argued that Gray, as the first author validly to publish *Ramaria* Holmsk., did so under this very name and authorship, and naturally did not refer to such Danish species described by Holmskjold as had not been recorded for the British Isles (forgetting *Clavaria botrytis* by an over-

[24] Compare Gray's "Preface" (p. xiii): "The death of Sir Joseph Banks, during the printing, has to my great regret, prevented me from [returning my thanks for the kind assistance I have received], as a slight return for the many advantages I have received from the use of his Library and Herbarium: and has also been a cause of great delay, in being obliged to wait the arrival of another copy of Esenbeck's work from Germany, that those interesting plants the fungi might be arranged according to the latest improvements."

sight). Gray, Corner stated, took Holmskjold's genus and *description* and merely put in it those British species which he had to list. If this had indeed been the case I would not have felt seriously troubled about Gray's re-publication, but, as demonstated above the inevitable conclusion is that Gray did gave the genus a new meaning, and this embarrassing point can not well summarily be put aside.[25].

TYPIFICATION. Comparing Gray's specific descriptions one by one with his generic description (quoted above), Donk (*1949:* 108) concluded that the species agreeing best with it was *Clavaria pratensis* Pers. and it was accordingly selected as the type. This selection would make it possible (but not very advisable) to maintain the connection between Gray's and Holmskjold's names in the author's citation, because *Clavaria pratensis* includes *Ramaria muscoides* Holmsk., which had been cited before (cf. Persoon, Syn. Fung. 590. 1801) as a synonym, correctly so, as is currently assumed. Corner (*1950:* 74) agreed: "*Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821) should strictly have precedence over *Clavulinopsis* Overeem, as it included *C. corniculata,* but the definition of *Ramaria* in this sense would be highly confusing and . . . is not to be recommended." Afterwards, when defending *Clavaria botrytis* as the type species and rejecting a choice by Doty, Corner (*1953:* 288) thought that if Doty's premiss (not accepted by Corner) were tenable, *C. corniculata* (= *C. pratensis*) should have been used as the type species of *Ramaria* as published by Gray.

When chosing the type, Donk was not yet aware of the lectotype proposed by Doty (*1948:* 134), who had selected *Clavaria rugosa* Bull. shortly before. Donk, deliberately, did not pick out this, Gray's second, species, for various reasons, a very obvious one being that Gray's description of it ("branches few, irregular") compares unfavourably with the generic one. On the here accepted basis for selecting types, prescribing, for instance, that a species agreeing very much better with the description (to which the generic name owes it valid publication) is preferable to one which agrees decidedly less well, I cannot follow Doty. There is another unfortunate side to Doty's choice: his selection (if accepted) would make *Ramaria* S. F. Gray the correct name for the genus now known as *Clavulina* J. Schroet., q.v. Recently Corner (*1953:* 286-290) has put forward several reasons why he, too, completely disagreed with Doty; one of them is that *Clavaria rugosa* as an almost unbranched species was not admitted by Holmskjold himself!

[25] Doty (*1950*: 21) stated that Donk (*1949*) "says Gray's genus was patterned after *Clavaria* Persoon." This must be due to an error because I defended on that occasion the above opinion. It is the only point of agreement in this matter between Doty and me and at the same time the only point of disagreement with Corner (*1953*).

Corner (*1950:* 124, 543, 689) has attempted to avoid the loss of the name *Ramaria* for the genus he so called by selecting *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. as the type species of *Ramaria* S. F. Gray. Recently he again concluded that "the basis of *Ramaria* auct. is *Ramaria* Holmsk. (1790), validated by S. F. Gray (1821)," and that this genus as emended by Donk and Corner should have *Clavaria botrytis* Fr. as its lectotype (Corner, *1953:* 286-290). This indeed would be the ideal solution (see below), but I am afraid that this species cannot be accepted for the generic name as published by Gray, for not only was it not mentioned by that author, but even implicitly excluded from the genus by Gray's generic description and intentions, as has been explained above.

ON RAMARIA HOLMSK. Gray ascribed the generic name to Holmskjold without supplying a bibliographic reference. I suspect that he picked up the name from Persoon's "Synopsis" (585. 1801) rather than from the original place of publication. It is usual to cite for *Ramaria* Holmsk. as its place of publication: Beata rur. Otia Fung. dan. 1. 1790 (or reprint: Coryph. Clav. Ram. 1797)[26]; and everbody has acted as if the genus was first published in that work. To all purposes the genus must be interpreted from Holmskjold's treatment of his genus in 1790. His species on that occasion are the following:

(1) *Ramaria medullaris H.* = *Calocera viscosa* (Pers. ex Fr.) Fr.
(2) *R. gelatinosa H.* = *Calocera viscosa* (according to Fries, *1821*: 486).
(3) *R. ornithopodioides H.* = *Clavulina cristata* (H. ex Fr.) J. Schroet. var. (or a closely related species).
(4) *R. muscoides* (L.) H. = *Clavaria corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr.
(5) *R. fastigiata* (L.) H. = *Clavaria corniculata.*
(6) *R. cristata* H. = *Clavulina cristata.*
(7) *R. farinosa* H. 1781 = *Isaria farinosa* (H.) ex Fr.
(8) *R. fimbriata* H. = *Clavaria byssiseda* "Pers." ex Fr. (according to Fries, *1821*: 476), a species of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. em. Donk or rather *Lentaria* Corner.
(9) *R. coratoides* H. = *Lentinus lepideus* (Fr.) Fr. (abnormal form; see Fries, Epicr. 387. 1838).
(10) *R. palmata* (Scop.) H. = *Thelephora palmata* (Scop.) ex Fr.
(11) *R. amethystina* H. = *Clavaria zollingeri* Lév.?, *Clavulina sp.?*
(12) *R. coralloides* (L.) H. = *Ramaria* (em.) spp. div. (mainly), and one form, *Clavaria coralloides* L. ex Fr., which (according to Fries, *1821*: 467) would be *Clavulina cristata* var.

[26] As to the various editions of this work, see Durand (*in* J. of Mycol. 13: 141-142. 1907) and Peltereau (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 44: 57-59. 1928).

It may be indicated briefly that Holmskjold already mentioned his genus on an earlier occasion. In his "Afhandling on nogle Kryptogamer" (*in* Skr. Vidensk. Selsk. ny. Saml. 1: 278-302 *with pl.* 1781) the generic name appeared for the first time in print, and one species, "Den meelede Greensvamp. (*Ramaria Farinosa*)," was described, discussed, and depicted (pp. 299-301), clearly not as a new genus based on a single species, but rather as one representing a genus of wider scope and not yet formally published. Compare also page 283, on which *Ramaria fimbriata* Holmsk. is casually mentioned. *Ramaria farinosa* is better known as *Isaria farinosa* (cf. Fries, Syst. mycol. 3: 271. 1832) and belongs to Deuteromycetes (Moniliales) !

Ramaria Rafin. (Anal. Nat. ou Tabl. Univ. 211. 1815) was published as a nomen nudum in "Clavaridia." I believe from experience gained in connection with other generic fungus names published by Rafinesque that he so called *Clavaria* group "A. Coralloideae . . . (RAMARIA Holmsk.)" of Persoon's (Syn. Fung 585. 1801).

MONADELPHOUS HOMONYM: *Ramaria* Holmsk. ex Quél., Fl. mycol. France 462. 1888.—Introduced for all branched species of *Clavaria* Fr., apparently independently of Gray and of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., q.v. Quélet called the genus "*Ramaria*, Holmsk." Doty (*1950:* 22) typified it by *Clavaria cristata* Fr., but this choice must be reconsidered, if a selection is thought of importance in this case. It must be emphatically denied that "Quélet (1888) did not recognize *Clavariella botrytis* . . . as a distinct species" (Doty, *1950:* 21). It must also be pointed out that there is no indication in Quélet's "Flore" that *Clavaria acroporphyrea* Schaeff. (Quélet took up an earlier name for *C. botrytis*) and other species are not at least as eligible as *C. cristata.*

NOMEN REJICIENDUM (proposed). It will be gathered from what is said under the present name and under *Ramaria* Bonord., q.v., that at least two validly published homonyms exist: *Ramaria* S. F. Gray 1821 (selected type species, *Clavaria pratensis*) and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. 1851 (selected type species, *C. botrytis*). Of these Donk (*1949a:* 108) proposed *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. as a nomen conservandum against *Ramaria* S. F. Gray and *Cladaria* Ritgen 1831 (or 1828), q.v., for the benefit of those mycologists who prefer to apply the name *Ramaria* to a segregate of *Clavaria* Fr. as delimited in a previous publication by Donk (*1933:* 103), and which is also sometimes called at present *Clavariella* P. Karst. (and cf. *Cladaria*). Those mycologists who preferred a quite inclusive genus of all the branched species of *Clavaria* were supposed not to raise objections

against the exchange of the author's citations "S. F. Gray" and "(Fr.) Bonord."[27]

Doty (*1948:* 128) is of the opinion that since *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., "this clearly illegitimate[28] name (a homonym) has not been widely used for the group, it seems inexcusable to conserve it." The fact is that Doty underestimated the previous use of *Ramaria.* Except by Gray, *Ramaria* has been taken up by Quélet (Fl. mycol. France 462. 1888; for nearly all European species), by Ricken (Vademecum Pilzfr. 251. 1918; and later editions; for most of the European species), and in several later, more or less popular, German booklets, for an inclusive genus; by Donk (*1933:* 103) for the species of The Netherlands and a few foreign ones, in the restricted generic sense as indicated above; and by Velenovsky (Novit. mycol. 161. 1939; Novit. mycol. nov. *in* Oper. bot. cech. 4: 88. 1947), for Czech species. Maire [*in* Publ. Inst. bot., Barcelona 3 (4): 31. 1937] already exchanged *Clavariella* against *Ramaria* and Corner (*1950*) followed in his comprehensive monograph. All these applications, when taken together, provide for numerous recombinations for species of *Clavaria* under *Ramaria:* of the species of *Ramaria* as emended by Donk not many correct names can have escaped.

On the other hand *Clavariella,* q.v., was applied, except by its originator, Karsten, by Patouillard (Hym. d'Eur. 155. 1887), by J. Schroeter [*in* Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schlesien 3 (1): 447. 1888]; and by Maire (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France 30: 216. 1914) and some later authors more or less incidentally rather than in comprehensive treatments. The total of ready recombinations available under *Clavariella* is very low and very much less than that under *Ramaria.* Of the two, *Ramaria* has (and had in 1933) unquestionably attained a by far greater popularity. For these reasons, rather than because of 'having committed myself to *Ramaria,*' I maintain the proposal for conservation of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. In Corner's monograph *Ramaria* is the biggest genus, comprising nearly one hundred (94) species (recombinations all made!).

The proposal discussed above was rejected by ballot by the Special Committee for Fungi (cf. *in* Taxon 2: 31. 1953; *in* Mycologia 45: 320. 1953). It may be that the disastrous consequences of this decision were not fully realized because of the conflicting opinions expressed in its connection. If no proposal of this kind were accepted, (i) *Ramaria* S. F. Gray would become the correct name for *Clavulinopsis* Overeem emend.

[27] An earlier proposal (Donk, *1941*: 158, 177), to conserve *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord against *Cladaria* Ritgen (no type selected), was replaced by the one here mentioned. It was disapproved of by Rogers (*1949*: 473).

[28] 'Illegitimate' of Doty is the same as 'impriorable' in this paper.

Corner (*1950;* 63 species), the large majority of which consists of unbranched species; and (ii) *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. (Corner, *1950;* 94 species) would become perhaps *Cladaria* Ritgen or else *Clavariella* P. Karst. In view of the chaotic situation that would result, I venture to move a new proposal, very much like the previous one, but altered by the selection of a different species as the type of *Cladaria* Ritgen, viz., *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. This also aims at making *Cladaria,* q.v., a completely harmless name as a rejected earlier typonym of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord.

It would be disturbing after all to breathe new life into the still lifeless name *Cladaria,* now that an attempt to save it for a certain group has been overtaken by the emendation of *Clavulinopsis* Overeem by Corner as a *fait accompli.* About the same can be said of *Ramaria* S. F. Gray. If the proposal will be sanctioned, this latter name, too, will be completely suppressed as a rejected homonym, which is preferable to letting these two names run wild, endangering not only *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. but also *Clavulinopsis,* both latter names adopted in Corner's outstanding monograph of the clavarias, which is undoubtedly fundamental to our understanding of the whole group.

Gray's "Natural arrangement of British plants" (vol. 1) had virtually fallen into oblivion during about a full century of the development of mycology and when it was taken into consideration in connection with the clavarias it was not yet definitely known to be post-Friesian. At Stockholm (1950), after prolonged discussions by the Special Committee for Fungi, it was decided (after it had already been rejected) not to alter its status as a legitimately published book. As a matter of course one may expect that its precarious admittance implies facilities for removing from competition such of Gray's generic names as are felt to be detrimental to nomenclatorial stability, one of the aims of the Code. In addition to this general remark, it may be pointed out that *Ramaria* S. F. Gray in particular was never taken up after its publication except once, by Doty (*1948:* 134) and that his tentative use of it as a substitute of *Clavulina* J. Schroet. must be qualified not only as confusing but also as a misapplication, because of the unacceptable type selection.

Ramaria (Fr.) Bonord., Handb. Mykol. 166. 1851. — ETYMOLOGY: ramus, branch. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected) : *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr.—Doty (*1948:* 128) thinks that "there is considerable confusion in regard to just which entity among clavarioid fungi should go with [the name *Clavaria botry-*

tis]. The name could be considered as a nomen confusum or a nomen ambiguum." This supposed confusion dates from Coker (Clav. U.S. and Can. 111-114. 1923; and cf. Coker *in* J. Mitchell sci. Soc. **63**: 47. 1947). I do not believe that European mycologists, who have collected the fungus themselves, are willing to subscribe to Doty's opinion. They are quite sure which species Persoon and Fries called *Clavaria botrytis;* it is one of the best known clavarioid fungi. (This does not imply that no errors have been committed, like Coker's; some measure of confusion exists in relation to practically every common fungus.) Corner (*1953:* 287-288), too, has expressed the opinion that there is nothing dubious about the application of the name *Clavaria botrytis.*

BASINYM: *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* Fr., Epicr. 571. 1838.—When establishing his genus, Bonorden called it *Ramaria* "Fr." and explicitly cited "*Clavaria.* Vaill. / Fries Epicrisis p. 571" as the genus which he divided into smaller genera.[29] This leads to the inevitable conclusion that *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* Fr. (1838) is to be regarded as the corresponding basinym. Fries's description of this taxon simply reads "Ramosae."

Fries did not refer back to his *Clavaria* trib. *Ramariae* Fr. (*1821:* 468) and it is quite clear why: in 1838 he completely abandoned his former classification of the clavarias and substituted a new one for it. In 1821 he divided *Clavaria* Fr. into "Trib. I. *Botryoideae* Nees," "Trib. II. *Ramariae,*" and "Trib. III. *Corynoideae.* Nees." The branched clavarias were grouped in accordance to Persoon (1801) and Nees (1817) and Fries especially followed the latter author (see under *Cladaria!*). He merely exchanged the name of the second subdivision '*Ramalinae* Nees' for '*Ramariae*' (no author cited), or, what is not unlikely, committed an unintentional error, for his group should really have been called '*Ramalinae* Nees.' It is obviously erroneous to assume that *Clavaria* trib. *Ramariae* Fr. 1821 and *Clavaria* I. *Ramaria* Fr. 1838 should be interpreted as the same taxon (Doty, *1950:* 21). '*Ramaria*' of 1838 corresponds to the combination of the two tribus of branched clavarias of 1821, and this combination in its turn answers to *Ramaria* Holmsk. Fries in 1838 carefully did not identify this taxon with '*Ramariae*' of 1821, but was not afraid afterwards of speaking of it as *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* "Holmsk." (Fries, *1874:* 666), which expressed after all the true situation; compare also Fries, Syst. mycol. 3 (Index): 151. 1832, where he stated that "*Ramaria* Holmsk. = *Clavariae ramulosae,*" and not that it would be

[29] Not, 'sections'! Why there would be "no obligate *Ramaria* Fries Epicrisis relationship" is another unexplained remark by Doty (in a Circular to the Members of the Special Committee for Fungi, dated Dec. 11, 1951).

Clavaria trib. *Ramariae* Fr. 1821! These is no indication that in connection with '*Ramariae*' of 1821 he really meant *Ramaria* Holmsk.; what is clear is that it corresponds to '*Ramalinae* Nees,' that is, to only a part of *Ramaria* Holmsk. It is a safe assumption that the infrageneric names of 1821 and 1838 are different names altogether. However, this point is of negligible importance, Bonorden's generic name being accompanied both by a description of its own and by an (indirect) reference to *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* Fr. 1838.

SCOPE. Bonorden did not adopt Fries's tribus (of 1838) unaltered in circumscription. He excluded, first, species with few, club-shaped branches, like *Clavaria rugosa,* which he transferred to *Holocoryne* Bonord., q.v., primarily founded for the unbranched species, and secondly, *Cornicularia* Bonord., q.v., which he characterized thus:

"4. G[attung] *Corniculuria.* Fr. / Diese Gruppe zeichnet sich dadurch aus, dass der Stamm nur in wenige kurze Aeste sich theilt, welche an der Spitze kleine rudimentäre Aeste haben. . . ."—Bonorden (Handb. Mykol. 166. 1851).

Thus he arrived at a genus (*Ramaria*) with the following description (and no mention of species by name):

"5. G[attung] *Ramaria* Fr. / Der Stamm ist bald dünn, bald sehr dick und theilt sich corallenartig in viele rundliche Aeste und Zweige. Die letzten ternären oder quaternären Aeste sind an den Spitzen gewöhnlich noch eingekerbt. . . . Die Mehrzahl der Ramarien wachsen in Wäldern, im Boden und bilden blumenkohlähnliche Gewächse . . .."—Bonorden (Handb. Mycol. 166. 1851).

THE EARLY CLASSIFICATION OF THE BRANCHED CLAVARIAS.—The tendency taxonomically to separate the branched clavarias from the undivided ones has been evident since the times of De Tournefort; compare *Coralloides* Tourn. (1696, 1700), *Corallo-Fungus* Vaill. (1723), and *Merisma* Hill (1751). The authority of Linnaeus (1753), who combined (but maintained) the two groups under *Clavaria,* temporarily put a stop to their separation on the generic level, but then Holmkjold (1790) introduced *Ramaria* as a genus for the branched forms. At first very unrelated elements were thrown together with the branched clavarias, but these were eliminated successively, mainly already by Holmskjold and Persoon.

The essays at classification of the branched clavarias may be divided into four often overlapping periods: (i) no subdivisions were thought necessary; (ii) the shape of the fruit-bodies prompted the recognition of two groups; (iii) the colour of the spores was emphasized and two groups were distinguished; lastly (iv) several characters were used to delimitate many groups and in certain cases the branched form was considered unimportant.

The second of these periods may be reviewed separatedly here in connection with questions of typification that have arisen and are now being discussed with some vigour among a small group of mycologists. After Holmkjold had admitted a distinct genus for the branched clavarias, the first author to divide that taxon (as an infrageneric one) was Persoon (1801) who admitted two groups based on the shape of the fruit-bodies, and tried to distinguish between compact forms and slender ones. It is of course not our task to evaluate the merits of this subdivision; the only aspect we are concerned with here is that it had enormous impetus lasting as it did for more than half a century. No other set of characters had any influence on the publication of genera until long after the generic names under discussion had been published, not even the division proposed by Fries in 1838, which was based on the colour of the spores. The influence of Persoon's early treatment of the branched clavarias stopped sometime after 1851 (Bonorden). During that half century (1801—1851), one line of authors thought one genus sufficient, but (if a subdivision was mentioned) subdivided it according to Persoon; and another line considered the not on the generic level, the two taxa distinguished were the same as two subdivisions distinct enough to be evaluated as genera. Whether or Persoon's. It would be erratic solely to depend on inessential hazards of publication and to typify the several names given to these two taxa by different species every time that they got new names. What I have tried to do is to anchor the two sets of names each to one type species and thus to recognize the importance of Persoon's influence according to more essential values.

The tabulation on the next page gives a review of the relevant denominations published for the branched clavarias between 1801 and 1851.

THE FIRST EMENDATION OF RAMARIA (Fr.) BORNORD.—Remembering that after the introduction of later starting-points the first restriction of *Ramaria* Holmsk., by Gray (1821), could not be taken into account for some time because it was not known to be definitely post-Friesian, it may be stipulated that (a) *Ramaria* Holmsk. was an inclusive genus; that (b) after the introduction of later starting-points the taxon started a new cycle as *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* Fr. (1838!); that (c) the first author to emend the latter taxon (in the rank of a genus) was Bonorden (1851), who excluded *Clavaria rugosa* (see under *Holocoryne*) and a group that almost certainly comprised *Clavaria corniculata* (*C. pratensis*) and perhaps even *Clavaria cristata* (see *Cornicularia*)!; that (d) the next author to emend and re-define *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., q.v., was Donk (*1933:* 103), who selected *Clavaria botrytis* as the (obvious and unescapable) type

1753	Linnaeus	*Clavaria* group Ramosae	
1790	Holmskjold	*Ramaria* Holmsk.	
1801	Persoon	*Clavaria* A. Coralloideae (*Ramaria* Holmsk.)	
		* Caule crassissimo.	** Caule tenui s. ramis omnibus simul sumtis tenuior.
1806	Roussel	*Coralloidea* Roussel	
1817	Nees	*Clavariae ramulosae* Nees	
		Botryoideae Nees	*Ramalinae* Nees
1821	Fries	*Clavaria* p.p.	
		Trib. *Botryoideae* Nees	Trib. *Ramariae* Fr. (= *Ramalinae* Nees)
1821	Gray	[Not treated.]	*Ramaria* Holmsk. (p.p.)
1828	Ritgen	*Cladaria* Ritgen	
1838	Fries	*Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* Fr. [Holmsk.]	
1851	Bonorden	*Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord.	(In part:) *Cornicularia* Bonord.
Type species		*Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr. (*Ramaria coralloides* var. *apicibus purpureis* Holmsk.)	*Clavaria pratensis* Pers. =/or *C. corniculata* Schaeff. ex Fr. (*Ramaria muscoides* Holmsk.)

species, before any other typifications of the generic name, or other connected ones, had been performed.

Donk acted strictly logical and legal under the then prevailing Rules and *could not follow any other course,* although this meant abandoning *Clavariella* P. Karst. (1881), a name he originally preferred (cf. *in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 18-20: 98. 1931). He did not want to propose *Clavariella* as a nomen conservandum against *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., because a careful examination of literature furnished evidence that *Ramaria* was predominantly used (especially in German and French literature) by those authors who dealt with the branched clavarias as generically district from the undivided ones.

Corner (*1950, 1953*) was convinced that the above representation of facts should be accepted as sound and even went further by interpolating *Ramaria* S. F. Gray between the devalidated name *Ramaria* Holmsk. and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. as a re-publication virtually covering the same taxon and, therefore, correctly typifiable by the same type as had been selected for *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. As explained under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, I am unable to follow him in this one respect.

On the other hand Doty completely disagreed. For instance, (i) I believe that it may be stated that he argued that *Ramaria* Holmsk. and its (direct or indirect) progeny were intrinsically conceived as white-spored genera (*1950:* 21-22); he also remarked (ii) that "the original

sense of *Ramaria* Holmskjold . . . is understood to be typified by *Ramaria cristata* Holmskjold (pre-Friesian)" (*1948:* 134); and he moreover stated categorically that (iii) the restriction of the name *Ramaria* to forms with generally yellow, dorsally-depressed, elongate spores was a digression from the original sense contrary to Recommendation VI of the Rules (of 1935).

It is easy to reject these opinions because they simply do not cover the facts. (i) The spore-colour played no part at all in the cases tabulated above and Holmskjold set the example in this respect by including species with white and with coloured spore-prints.[30] (ii) Nowhere am I able to find that Holmskjold's generic name, or any other name given to the branched clavarias, had been typified, or restricted to a taxon, in such a manner that *Ramaria* Holmsk. must be understood to be typified by *Ramaria cristata*. It was Doty himself who first typified *Ramaria* Holmsk. ex Quél. (see under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray) by *Clavaria cristata* (*1950:* 22) and *Ramaria* S. F. Gray by *C. rugosa* (*1948:* 134). There is no room whatever to suppose that *Ramaria* Holmsk. was the natural precursor of *Clavulina* J. Schroet. It could only be arbitrarily turned into that genus by selecting a species of *Clavulina* as type and this was what Doty tried to do by selecting *Clavaria rugosa* Bull. ex Fr. for *Ramaria* as re-published by Gray (1821). This attempt must be stamped as complete failure, not even sanctioned by the Code. As has been explained under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, *Clavaria rugosa* was not admitted to the genus by Holmskjold and among Gray's species it represents about the least eligible one! (iii) See above and Corner (*1950:* 124; *1953:* 285-290). From the standpoint of the Code there are at least three different names: *Ramaria* Holmsk. (devalidated name), *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, and *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord., and Donk was the first to typify *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. long before Doty tried his hand. Finally, it may be remarked that Donk acted precisely in accordance with the spirit of Recomm. VI when he proposed *C. botrytis* as the type species.[31]

---

[30] It seems that to Doty all species of *Clavulina* J. Schroet. are white-spored, which is not the case. — The large brown-spored species of *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. emend. Donk, Holmskjold treated as varieties of *Clavaria coralloides* L. (Sp. Pl. 2: 1182. 1753) and in this he followed Linnaeus. If Holmskjold's concept of that species also comprised white-spored forms (of which I am not yet sure), this would be the best demonstration of the fact that spore-colour was not in the least taken into account by him. — Doty failed to substantiate his contention that *C. coralloides* L. [and *Ramaria coralloides* (L.) Holmsk.] should be cited as synonymous with *C. cristata*. I look forward with keen interest to the results of his efforts to make good for this omission.

[31] This Recommendation has disappeared as such from the Code.

TYPIFICATION. When previously selecting the type, Donk (*1933:* 104) took a species common to Holmskjold's genus[32] and Fries's *Clavaria* trib. *Ramaria* (1838), and at the same time agreeing well with—or at least not contradicting anything in—Bonorden's description: *Clavaria botrytis* Pers. ex Fr. I would rather say that if one reads carefully Bonorden's description one cannot avoid thinking in the first place of this well known fungus ("blumenkohlähnlich Gewächse"). Corner (*1950:* 542, 689) accepted this choice but calls the genus: "*Ramaria* S. F. Gray emend. Donk / . . . 1821 . . .: Bonorden . . . 1851 . . .: Donk . . . 1933 . . . et . . . 1941 . . .: Maire . . . 1937 . . .." Elsewhere (*op. cit.* p. 689) he listed "*Ramaria* Bon., Quél." as a synonym of *Ramaria* S. F. Gray, both with *Clavaria botrytis* as type species. The typification of the generic name *Ramaria* Bonord. is to be guided by the description to which it owes it valid publication and in agreement with the accompanying reference to the tribus name of 1838, but in no way depends on the typification of the name of Fries's tribus '*Ramariae*' of 1821.

AUTHOR'S CITATION. Before Rogers had concluded that S. F. Gray's first volume of "A natural arrangement of British plants" was published after the first volume of Fries's "Systema," Donk (*1933:* 103) accepted as the author citation "(Holmskj. ex Fr.) Bon." Afterwards he dropped the author's indication "Holmskj." and called the genus "*Ramaria* (Fr.) Bon." (Donk, *1941:* 177), because the connection of Holsmkjold's name with that of Bonorden appeared problematic and also because he was at a loss as to how to typify *Ramaria* Holmskj., q.v., not having been able to consult the presumably first use of that name in 1781 (see p. 478 of the present paper). Finally, he adopted the view now made legal that *Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821) was validly published and that *Ramaria* (Fr.) Bonord. (1851) was a later homonym of it (Donk *1949:* 107).

TYPONYMS: *Corallium* Hahn (1883), and compare *Ramaria* S. F. Gray and *Cladaria* Ritgen. — HOMONYMS: *Ramaria* Holmsk. (1790; devalidated name; "Clavariaceae") and *Ramaria* S. F. Gray (1821; "Clavariaceae"), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the validly published homonym of 1821. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM (proposed). See under *Ramaria* S. F. Gray.

Ramariopsis (Donk) Corner, Monogr. Clav. (*in* Ann. of Bot. Mem. 1:) 636, 700. 1950 (as *Ramariopsis* Donk). — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Ramaria; ὄψις.* appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation, both for basinym and isonym): *Clavaria kunzei* Fr. — BASINYM: *Clavaria*

[32] *Ramaria coralloides* var. *apicibus purpureis* Holmsk.

subgen. *Ramariopsis* Donk, Revis. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. 2: 89. 1933 (*in* Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 22 & *in* Meded. bot. Mus. Herb. Univ. Utrecht No. 9).—Introduced for the type species and a number of other species part of which was mentioned by name. — SCOPE. The generic name was applied to an emended group.

[*Scleroglossum* Pers. *apud* Moug. & Nestler, Stirp. Crypt. vogesorhen. No. 671. 1820 (devalidated name). — Type species (selected for basinym): *Clavaria herbarum* Pers. = *Acrospermum compressum* Tode ex Fr.—See *Xyloglossum* Pers. — Basinym: *Xyloglossum* Pers. (1818), q.v. — This isonym was introduced on the label to *Scleroglossum lanceolatum* Pers. apud Moug. & Nestler (type distribution), *l.c.*, as follows: "Nomini generico *Xyloglossum* Pers. Champ. comest. p. 144 substituit cel. autor *Scleroglossum*." This latter name seems not to have been validly republished after 1821. — This name is sometimes mentioned as a synonym of *Pistillaria* Fr., for instance by Saccardo & P. Sydow (*in* Sacc., Syll. Fung. 16: 1282. 1902) and by Ainsworth & Bisby (Dict. Fung. 267. 1943; 2d Ed., 285. 1945); more often it is made a synonym of *Acrospermum* Tode ex Fr.

I could trace the following combinations published under *Scleroglossum*:

(i) *Scleroglossum lanceolatum* Pers. "in Litt." *apud* Moug. & Nestler, Stirp. Crypt. vogesorhen. No. 671 1820.[33]—This is an avowed isonym of *Clavaria herbarum* Pers., which is cited as a synonym. The species should be known as *Acrospermum compressum* Tode ex Fr. The generic name *Scleroglossum* was introduced on the label of this distribution.

(ii) *Scleroglossum conicum* Pers. "in Litt." *apud* Moug. & Nestler, Stirp. Crypt. vogesorhen. No. 672. 1820 (nomen nudum; only the habitat is mentioned).[34]—A few years later Persoon (Mycol. europ. 1: 290. 1822) merely stated in an observation to *Peziza scleropyxis* Pers. that the latter species was found associated with *S. conicum*. It was Fries [Syst. mycol. 2 (2): 246. 1822] who furnished a description of it under the name *Acrospermum conicum* Fr., citing Persoon's figures 5 & 6 (Mycol. europ. 1: *pl. 11*).

(iii) *Sclercglossum acrospermum* "Pers."—Saccardo (Syll. Fung. 6: 752. 1888) followed Fries (*1874*: 686) in citing "*Sclcroglossum Acrospermum* Pers. Ch. comest. pag. 143, Myc. Eur. I, t. 11, f. 3-4 . . ." as a synonym of *Pistillaria sclerotioides* (DC.) ex Fr. Now, neither in Persoon's "Traité sur les champignons comestibles" (1818), nor in his "Mycologia europaea" (1. 1822) one will find the name *Scleroglossum acrospermum*. In the first mentioned of Persoon's works one will encounter *Clavaria sclerotioides* DC. on the page cited (p. 143). (The pertinent passage is quoted in the

[33] Mougeot added in ink on the labels of the copies of the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) and the Kew Herbarium, "et Myc. Eur. tab. XI, f. 8." After kind information from Mrs. F. L. Balfour-Browne and Miss E. M. Wakefield.

[34] Mougeot added in ink on the labels of the copies of the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) and the Kew Herbarium, "et Myc. Eur. tab. XI, fig. 6 & 7," and ". . . fig. 5, 6, 7" repectively. After kind information from Mrs. F. L. Balfour-Browne and Miss E. M. Wakefield.

present paper under *Xyloglossum*.) In Persoon's second work mentioned above no explanation to plate 11, figures 3 and 4 is to be found, but Fries [Syst. mycol. 2 (2): 245. 1822] cited them as pertaining to *Acrospermum sclerotioides* (DC. ex Fr.) Fr.[35] = *Pistillaria sclerotioides*, presumably on the authority of Persoon or of one of the latter author's correspondents, who may have communicated the manuscript-name *Scleroglossum acrospermum* Pers. to replace *Clavaria sclerotioides* DC.[36] — One of the two original species of *Xyloglossum*, the other being *Clavaria herbarum* Pers.

The inevitable conclusion is that *Scleroglossum* is a mere name change for *Xyloglossum* Pers., q.v., a name to be excluded from "Clavariaceae" on account of the nature of the type species selected in the present paper and synonymous with *Acrospermum*. This was obviously also Fries's conclusion [Syst. mycol. 3 (Index): 154. 1832], "*Scleroglossum* Pers. vide *Xyloglossum*," and (*op. cit.* p. 199), "*Xyloglossum* Pers. / *herbarum* Pers. (*Acrospermum compressum*) / *Sclerotioides* Pers. (*Acrosp. Sclerotioides*)." Moreover, Fries [Syst. mycol. 2 (2): 244. 1822] cited "*Xyloglossi* spec. Pers. Ch. Com." under *Acrospermum* Tode."]

Scleromitra Corda *in* Sturm, Deutschl. Fl., Pilze Hft. 7: 59. 1829. — ETYMOLOGY: *σκληρός* hard; *μίτρα*, turban. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Pistillaria coccinea* Fr.—Fries [Syst. mycol. 3 (Index): 154. 1832] identified Corda's plant with *Pistillaria micans* (Pers.) ex Fr. — REMARK. *Cnazonaria* Corda and *Scleromitra* were simultaneously published; Donk (Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. 2: 96. 1933) listed the latter name as a synonym of the former, thus making it an incorrect name for a genus called *Cnazonaria*.

Scytinopogon Singer *in* Lloydia 8: 139. 1945. — ETYMOLOGY: *σκύτινος*, made of leather; *πώγων*, beard. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Lachnocladium pallescens* (Bres.) Bres.—Regarded conspecific with *Clavaria angulispora* Pat. by Corner (*1950:* 649). — SCOPE. A second species was mentioned as probably belonging to the genus.

Sparassis Fr. ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 464. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: *σπαράσσω*. I tear in pieces. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sparassis crispa* (Wulf.) ex Fr. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Sparassis* Fr., Novit. Fl. suec., Partic. V, Contin. 80. 1819 (n.v.). — HOMONYM. Some authors consider *Sparaxis* Ker-Gawl. (1804; Iridaceae) an orthographic-

[35] For a while Fries thought that two fungi were involved, a species of *Pistillaria* and one of *Acrospermum* [Syst. mycol. 3 (Index): 1. 1832; Epicr. 586. 1838], but later he reconsidered this opinion (*1874*: 686).

[36] There is in the Kew Herbarium a specimen labelled in Mougeot's handwriting: "*Scleroglossum bulbosum* Pers. in Litt. Pers. Mycol. Europ. tab. XI, fig. 3, 4. / *Clavaria sclerotioides* De Cand. F. Fr. / In caulibus *Gentianae luteae*." After kind information by Miss E. M. Wakefield.

ally different homonym. — ISONYM: *Masseeola* O.K., q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable if considered a later homonym, and, therefore, replaced by *Masseeola* O.K.

Sphaerula Pat., Tab. anal. Fung. 1: 27. 1883 (description and figure reproduced *in* Rev. mycol. 5: 191 *pl. 38 f. 4.* 1883). — ETYMOLOGY: sphaerula, small ball. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sphaerula capitata* Pat.

Stelligera Heim *ex* Doty *in* Lloydia 11: 134. 1948. — ETYMOLOGY: stella, star; gero, I bear. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Stelligera membranacea* Heim ex Doty. — PROTONYM: *Stelligera* Heim *in* C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris 206: 1922. 1938 (nomen nudum).—French descriptio generico-specifica: no Latin description. — VALID PUBLICATION. Doty furnished Latin descriptions for both the genus and the only species, and proceeded to accept *Stelligera* as a "legitimate name in consideration of the diagnosis and discussion" published for it by him. From his introductory discussion (Doty, *op. cit.* pp. 124-125) it becomes clear that in this case 'legitimate' agrees with what I prefer to call 'priorable.' It is not at once evident that he accepted the genus also from a taxonomic point of view and considered *Stelligera* a 'correct' name. If not, even the Latin description would not ensure the name the status of a validly published one; compare Art. 43: "A name . . . which is not accepted by the author who published it . . . is not validly published." Doty's discussion summarizes his views about the genus as follows: "*Eriocladus* [*Lachnocladium*] and *Vararia* differ in form of fructification; *Stelligera* differs from these by the possession of cystidia in addition to the more highly modified setae (asterophyses)." Apart from this statement being correct or not, it may perhaps be taken as proof that Doty accepted the genus; also because, when dealing with *Eriocladus* (Doty, *op cit.* p. 131), he did not mention *Stelligera* and his characterisation of *Eriocladus* would even seem to exclude *Stelligera:* ". . . the genus . . . is characterized by the dichophyses in the hymenial and subhymenial layers." These quotations would be conclusive only if one would believe that Doty seriously thought the presence of cystidia to be restricted to *Stelligera* and that, in addition, he really rated the 'asterosetae' of *Stelliger* as fundamentally different from the 'dichophyses' of *Eriocladus (Lachnocladium)* ! It is my tentative impression that Doty, besides furnishing a Latin description, also taxonomically adopted the genus and thus validly published the name *Stelligera.*

Stichoclavaria Ulbrich *in* Lindau, KryptFl. Anfänger, 3. Aufl., 1: 83. 1928. — ETYMOLOGY: sticho(basidium); the genus *Clavaria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): "*St. falcata* (Pers.) Ulbrich" = *Clavaria falcata* Fr. sensu Juel.—There is every reason to believe that this is a different species from the true *Clavaria falcata* Fr., the selected type species of *Holocoryne* Bonord.

Stichoramaria Ulbrich *in* Lindau, KryptFl. Anfänger, 3. Aufl., 1: 83. 1928. — ETYMOLOGY: sticho(basidium): the genus *Ramaria*. Gender f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): "*St. cristata* (Holmsk.) Ulbrich" = *Clavulina cristata* (Holsmsk. ex Fr.) J. Schroet. — SCOPE. Introduced for those species of *Clavulina* J. Schroet. of which it had been cytologically demonstrated that they had stichic basidia: *Clavulina rugosa* (Bull. ex Fr.) J. Schroet. (first species), *Clavulina cristata, Clavulina cinerea* (Bull. ex Fr.) J. Schroet., and *Clavaria grisea* Pers. ex Fr. — TYPIFICATION. Doty (*1948:* 135), to whom *Clavulina rugosa* seems to be the ideal branched clavarioid species,[37] proposed this species as lectotype. In view of the original description (" ± korrallenartig verzweigt") and the popular name attributed to the genus ("Korallenpilz") it clearly is not the most eligible species. — I prefer instead *Clavulina cristata,* selected here for the first time — TYPONYM: *Clavulina* J. Schroet. (1888), and compare *Ramaria* Holmsk. (devalidated name).

Typhidium Clem.—See *Typhula.*

Typhula (Pers.) Fr. *ex* Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 494. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Typha,* the reed-mace. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Typhula phacorrhiza* (Reichard) ex Fr. — BASINYM: *Clavaria* sect. *Typhula* Pers., Syn. Fung. xviii. 1801 (devalidated name).[38]—Introduced for six species of which *Clavaria ovata* Pers. is the first, *Clavaria gyrans* Batsch the third, and *C. phacorrhiza* Reichard the last one; the latter species was apparently not known to Persoon except from the existing descriptions. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Typhula* (Pers.) Fr., Obs. mycol. 2: 296. 1818.—Of the four species Fries included, *Clavaria gyrans, C. erythropus* Pers., and *C. phacorrhiza* are original species of Persoon. — SCOPE. In the starting-point book Fries (*1821:* 494) included

[37] Typically it is often simple rather than branched. See also "Remark" under *Clavulina.*

[38] Compare also Persoon (Obs. mycol. 2: 60. 1799) in an observation appended to *Clavaria muscicola* Pers.: Familiam quandam naturalem cum *Clavaria gyrante, Erythropo* etc. (vid. Comm. de fung. clavae. p. 80—85.) quidem efficit . . .." Persoon used 'familia' for 'section' at that time.

eight species, *Typhula todei* Fr. being the first.[39] Of the original species of Persoon, *Clavaria ovata* Pers. and *C. muscicola* Pers. found a place in *Pistillaria* Fr. instead of in *Typhula*. — TYPIFICATION. Doty (*1948:* 136) has called attention to what might be considered the first appointment of the type species: "Ce genre est fondé sur le *Clavaria gyrans*, Pers., et sur quelques autres espèces voisines."—Brogniart (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. **33**: 575. 1824; Essai Classif. nat. Champ. 86. 1825). Actually Brongniart merely said that *Typhula* was based on a number of species of which he mentioned one by name; all the same the manner of this mentioning may be significant. — More recently (without knowledge of Brongniart's remark) *Clavaria phacorrhiza* was selected by both Donk (*1933:* 93) and, independently, by Remsburg (*in* Mycologia **32**: 65. 1940). Doty (*l.c.*) proposed the same species as lectotype, and Corner (*1950:* 147, 658, 689) also adopted it. — The species suggested as the type by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) for "*Typhula* Pers. . . . 1801; Fr. . . . 1818" (applied as a generic name), viz., "*Typhula sclerotioides* Fr," cannot be seriously considered as it is not an original one, neither of Persoon nor of Fries. — ISONYM: *Typhidium* Clem. *in* Univ. Stud. Nebraska **3** (1): 73. 1902.—This was introduced for grammatical reasons as follows: "*Typhula* = *Typhidium*"—nothing else. As not even an author was cited for *Typhula*, the new name should apparently be valued as not validly published.

[*Xyloglossum* Pers. *ex* Link *in* Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin 1824: 175. 1826. — Type species (selected): *Clavaria herbarum* Pers., Comment. Fung. clavaef. 68 *pl. 3 f. 4* 1797 = *Acrospermum compressum* Tode ex Fr. (type species of *Acrospermum* Tode ex Fr.). — Devalidated name: *Xyloglossum* Pers., Traité Champ. comest. 144. 1818.—The publication of *Xyloglossum* by Persoon runs as follows:

"Quoique les *Clavaria herbarum* et *Clav. sclerotioides*, Decand. suppl. p. 29, aient le port des champignons du dixième ordre,[40] ils n'ont cependant pas de membrane fructifère ou *hymenium*, et ne sont pourvus à l'extérieur de graines comme le sont les clavaires; ils sont au contraire de la nature des scléroties, et doivent y être rapportés, mais sous un genre particulier (*Xyloglossum*)."—Persoon (Traité Champ. comest. 143-144. 1818). *Xyloglossum* is also mentioned in the same work on pages 51 and 130 (name only)."

This generic name was validly re-published by Link:

"*Xyloglossum* eine sonderbare Gattung von einer Gestalt welche sich *Clavaria* nähert, auch ist ein wahrer Sprosstheil vorhanden."—Link (*l.c.*).

[39] This has been suspected of being a synonym of *Pistillaria quisquiliaris* Fr. (cf. under *Pistillaria* Fr.), but see also Corner's remarks under *Pistillaria todei* (Fr.) Corner (*1950*: 493).

[40] Rather: "deuxième ordre," of Fungi Hymenomyci, page 38, famille des Helvelloïdes, page 75, inclusive of *Clavaria* (les Clavaires), page 84.

The next author to deal with the genus under this name after 1821 was Leman (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. 59: 158. 1829) : he retained the earlier name, rejected the isonym *Scleroglossum* Pers., q.v., and treated the species on this occasion.

"*Xyloglossum.* (Bot.) Genre de la famille des champignons, établi par Persoon, dans son Traité des champignons comestibles, pag. 51, 143. Il le range près du *Sclerotium*, et fait observer qu'il diffère du *Clavaria* par le défaut d'une membrane fructifère ou hyménium, et parce que les graines ne sont point à l'extérieur. Ce naturaliste se borne à ce peu de mots, et il cite les *clavaria herbarum* et *sclerotioides*, Dec., Fl. fr., 6, pag. 29, comme les espèces de son genre."—Leman (*l.c.*). Follows the treatment of both species. — Compare also the entry of *Scleroglossum* by Leman (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. 48: 154. 1827): "*Scleroglossum.* (Bot.) Nom donné par Persoon au genre *Acrospermum* de Tode, qu'il avoit d'abord appelé *Xyloglossum.*"

Compare also Dierbach's translation of Persoon's "Traité sur les champignons comestibles" which appeared after 1821 (Pers. Abh. essb. Schwämme 89. 1822). Later on Persoon changed *Xyloglossum* into *Scleroglossum* Pers., q.v. — Typification. The two original species are to-day interpreted as widely different fungi. The first, *Clavaria herbarum*, has been identified with *Acrospermum compressum* by Persoon himself (Syn. Fung. 605. 1801) and Fries [Syst. mycol. 2 (2) : 245. 1822] ; modern descriptions were published under the latter name by Riddle (*in* Mycologia 12: 176-178 *pl. 11 fs. 6-12.* 1920) and Brandriff (*in* Mycologia 28: 228-235 *fs. 1-11.* 1936). It is a pyrenomycetous fungus of still uncertain position. The second of Persoon's original species, *Clavaria sclerotioides* DC., is Fries's *Pistillaria sclerotioides* (DC.) ex Fr. [not to be confused with *Typhula sclerotioides* (Pers.) Fr., the type species of *Phacorhiza* Pers., q.v.]. This is generally considered to be a clavariaceous plant. The selection of Persoon's first species would make *Xyloglossum* a synonym of *Acrospermum*, and of his second species, a validly published name in "Clavariaceae." I select the first species as the type, a choice suggested by the generic name, this species being often compressed. — Isonym: *Scleroglossum* Pers., q.v.]

REMARK. Dierbach's translation "Abhandlungen über die essbaren Schwämme" (1822) of Persoon's "Traité sur les champignons comestibles" (1818[41]) offers a peculiar nomenclatural difficulty: is it to be taken as a 'different' publication from the original one? If it is, *Xyloglossum*, for instance, would be validly re-published after 1821; if not, *Xyloglossum*, as published by Persoon, remains merely a devalidated name. Or, in different words, has one to admit a name *Xyloglossum* Pers. ex Pers. [Dierb.] 1822 in addition to *Xyloglossum* Pers. 1818? (The starting-point date for "Fungi caetei" is 1821.)

[41] My copy is dated 1819.

The problem arises in a much simpler form in connection with Fries's "Observationes." This work was published before 1821, but a so-called second edition was issued dated 1824. All the differences between these two 'editions' exist in a new title-page tipped in the original issue to replace the earlier title-page: compare Rogers (*in* Mycologia **31**: 297-307. 1939). I agree with Rogers that this so-called second edition should be dated the same as the original issue. Only the new title-page is a 'publication' of 1824.

Dierbach's translation is nothing but a translation, without alterations in the original text; what is new in it is to be found in his observations which he added separately ("Aus dem Französischen und mit einigen Anmerkungen begleitet von J. H. Dierbach"). The contents was apparently not revised by Persoon before or after the translation: it is a faithful reproduction of the original text (inclusive of errors of printing in several names) in another language, not a new publication. What is new in this German issue are the "Anmerkungen" by Dierbach; these, of coure, constitute a distinct publication to be dated 1822; the translation itself, I would conclude, should be treated as if it had appeared in 1818.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following titles have been cited by their dates printed in italics:

CORNER, E. J. H. (1950): A monograph of *Clavaria* and allied genera. (Annals of Botany Memoirs No. 1).

——— (1953): Generic names in Clavariaceae. *In* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. 35.

DONK, M. A. (1933): Revision der niederländischen Homobasidiomycetae-Aphyllophoraceae II. (Meded. Bot. Mus. Herb. Univ. Utrecht No. 9 & Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 22).

——— (1941): Nomina generica conservanda and confusa for Basidiomycetes (Fungi). *In* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17.

——— (1949): New and revised nomina generica conservanda proposed for Basidiomycetes (Fungi). *In* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18.

——— (1950): Summary of proposals. Bogor. (Mimeographed).

DOTY, M. S. (1948): Proposals and notes on some genera of Clavarioid fungi and their types. *In* Lloydia 11.

——— (1950): Nomenclatural principles and rules in reference to certain fungal and algal generic names. *In* Lloydia 13.

FRIES, E. M. (1821): Systema mycologicum. Volumen I. Lund.

——— (1874): Hymenomycetes europaei. Upsala.

ROGERS, D. P. (1949): Nomina conservanda proposita and nomina confusa—Fungi. *In* Farlowia 3.

——— (1950): Nomina conservanda proposita and nomina confusa—Fungi. Supplement. *In* Farlowia 4.

——— (1950a): [One-page enclosure to reprint of above paper]. (Mineographed).